



Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-027
Wednesday
10 February 1988

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-027

CONTENTS

10 February 1988

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Further Reportage on Supreme Soviet Session	1
Yazov Address on INF [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Feb]	1
Ligachev Comparison [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Feb]	3
Shevardnadze Correction, Comparison [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Feb]	4
Commission Proceedings	5
"Studio 9" on Post-Summit World [Zorin, Zagladin, Petrovskiy]	8

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov's 4 Feb Press Conference Summarized [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Feb]	17
'International Commentary' on Kohl in CSSR [Mushkaterov in IZVESTIYA 2 Feb]	17
Air Terrorism Condemned at International Meeting	18
Shakhnazarov's 'World Government' Idea Criticized [Bovin in PRAVDA 1 Feb]	18
Church Millennium Conference Opens in Leningrad [IZVESTIYA 2 Feb]	19
More on Venice Human Rights Symposium	19
Delegate Interviewed on UN Human Rights Panel [PRAVDA 10 Feb]	20
UNESCO Cultural Assets Convention Ratified	21

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Reacts to Gorbachev Afghanistan Speech	22
Seen as 'Main News' of Day [PRAVDA 10 Feb]	22
Murphy's Middle East Tour Sparks Comment	23
U.S.-Israeli Efforts 'Futile' [PRAVDA 4 Feb]	23
Peace Plan 'Doomed' To Fail	23
U.S. 'Cool' to Mubarak's Mideast Peace Proposals [Belyakov in PRAVDA 8 Feb]	24
Reagan Talks With Saudi Foreign Minister	24
Moscow Comments on Reagan's Plan To Aid Contras [Lidiya Podolnaya commentary]	25
'Experts' Dispute Official View of KAL Incident	25

China

Joint Border Photography Planned	26
Alekseyev Reviews Improvement in Ties	26
Komsomol Official on Youth Cooperation	26

Northeast Asia

USSR Protests Japanese Demonstrations	27
Downturn in Trade With Japan Only Temporary [PRAVDA 28 Jan]	27
Japan-USSR Economic Talks Reviewed	28
U.S. Planning Military 'Show of Force'	28

Southeast Asia & Pacific

More on Indonesia's Mokhtar Talks in Moscow	29
Mokhtar Interviewed	29
Joint Announcement Issued [PRAVDA 8 Feb]	29
Mokhtar Departure Statement Reported	31
Seen Off at Departure	32
Sihanouk Proposals Unacceptable in Cambodia	32

Near East & South Asia

Vorontsov Arrives in Pakistan for Talks	32
Cordovez Continues Talks on Afghanistan	32
'Positively' Assesses Results	32
Arrives in Geneva	33
Afghan Official Welcomes Gorbachev Statement	33
Weekly Cites U.S. Journalist on Dushman Killings [Andronov in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 10 Feb]	34
Dobrynin Receives Indian Defense Minister	34

Sub-Saharan Africa

Coup in South African Homeland Reported	34
RSA, U.S. Accused of Chemical Warfare	35
Gromyko Receives Mali's Traore	35
Ryuytel Delegation Ends Visit to Cape Verde	36
Ethiopia Winning War With 'Separatists' [Tarutin in PRAVDA 31 Jan]	37
AUCCTU To Send Aid to Mozambique [TRUD 2 Feb]	37

East Europe

Poland's Orzechowski on Official Visit to Moscow	38
Honors Soviet Heroes	38
Received by Gromyko	38
PAP on Gromyko Meeting	38
Cultural Accord Signed	39
Shevardnadze Hosts Dinner [PAP]	39
Interviewed On Cooperation	39

West Europe

FRG's Spaeth Continues Visit to Moscow	40
Meets With Gorbachev	40
Recounts Gorbachev Meeting	41
Meets With Kamentsev	42
Meets With Tolstykh	42
Possible Summit Discussed [DPA]	42
Economic Ties Reviewed	42
AFP Roundup of Visit	43
FRG Firm To Convert SS-20 Launchers [DPA]	43
Commission on Waldheim's War Record Concludes	44
Military-Political Situation in N. Europe Viewed [Kuzar]	44
Preliminary Results of Finnish Poll Analyzed [PRAVDA 3 Feb]	45
Foreign Trade Association Seeks Finnish Clients [IZVESTIYA 6 Feb]	46
Soviet-French Paris Symposium Held on Relations [IZVESTIYA 9 Feb]	46

Latin America & Caribbean

Noriega Demands Withdrawal of Southern Command	46
Cuban Party Schools Sign Cooperation Agreement [PRAVDA 7 Feb]	47
Persisting Tensions in Argentina Viewed [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Feb]	47
Chilean Communists Describe Upcoming Plebiscite	48

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

PRAVDA Describes Gromyko Visit to Belorussia	49
Tours Minsk [2 Feb]	49
Addresses Supreme Soviet [3 Feb]	49
Gromyko Addresses Lithuanian Soviet Workers [PRAVDA 6 Feb]	53
Songayla Addresses Lithuanian Party Plenum [PRAVDA 29 Jan]	57
Vayno Addresses Estonian Party Plenum [Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 19 Jan]	58
Zaykov Addresses Radio Ministry Collegium [PRAVDA 6 Feb]	64
Vlasov Attends Moscow MVD Organs' Meeting [MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 29 Jan]	64
Militia HQ Holds Briefing on Crime Statistics	65
International Church Conference Held	65
Aviation Officials Accept PRAVDA Criticism [PRAVDA 2 Feb]	65
Workers Complain of Pollution, Food Supplies [PRAVDA 29 Jan]	66
Roy Medvedev on Bukharin's Rehabilitation [Rome LA REPUBBLICA 6 Feb]	67
After Difficulties, Kirov Movie Reaches TV [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 3 Feb]	67
Alma-Ata Mud Flow Damage Due to 'Carelessness'	68

Economic

Rytov on 'Complex, Contradictory' Shortages [IZVESTIYA 9 Feb]	68
Nikitenkov Explains Enterprises' Insurance Plans [IZVESTIYA 6 Feb]	69

Scientific

Sakharov Calls for Underground Nuclear Reactors	71
Atomic Power Minister Cited on Safety Measures	71
Activities of 'Mir' Crew Described	71
Romanenko on Post-Space Flight Reactions	72

Military

Stalin's Role in Air Defense Forces Recalled [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Feb]	72
Prosecutor Outlines Limits of Self-Defense [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jan]	73

Further Reportage on Supreme Soviet Session

Yazov Address on INF

PM101347 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
10 Feb 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS account of speech by Dmitriy Yazov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and USSR minister of defense, at a session of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Council of the Union and Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, held to discuss ratification of the INF Treaty, in the Kremlin Hall of the Council of Nationalities—under the general headline “From Confrontation to Peaceful Coexistence”]

[Text] Esteemed comrades deputies! Esteemed guests! The treaty presented for discussion between the Soviet Union and the United States on the elimination of intermediate-and shorter-range missiles is the first real step along the path of implementing the course confirmed by the 27th CPSU Congress for the full elimination of nuclear and other forms of weapons of mass destruction. It envisages the destruction of two classes of U.S. and Soviet missiles. At the same time, the sides pledge not to produce any further ground-based ballistic or cruise missiles with a range of 500-5,500 km and not to carry out flight tests on them. Thus, a practical start has in fact been made on building a world without nuclear weapons.

Allow me, comrade deputies, to give an assessment of the treaty from the position of its effect on ensuring the reliable defense of the Soviet Union and other socialist states. This is especially important because of the fact that letters from the Soviet people are reaching the Ministry of Defense which express concern either directly or indirectly: Will harm not be done to the security of the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community through the Soviet Union's destruction of more missiles under the treaty than are to be destroyed by the United States? If one considers the treaty solely from the point of view of the number of missiles liable to be destroyed then we shall indeed have to destroy roughly twice as many missiles. However, this is not a question of arithmetic. When assessing the treaty, apart from the figures, it is also necessary to take other circumstances into account—political, military, moral, and psychological circumstances.

From the military point of view, the first such circumstance is that the United States is eliminating in Europe its intermediate-range missiles which, in relation to the Soviet Union, are strategic missiles for all intents and purposes. They can reach targets on USSR territory and its allies' territory in a flight time of 8-10 minutes, which makes it unlikely that any antimissile defense would work. These missiles have aroused in some people the false hope of being able to win a “limited” nuclear war. The treaty removes both these false hopes and the real threat to the European part of the USSR and to its allies.

The second circumstance consists in the fact that our missiles, while counterbalancing U.S. nuclear forward-based systems, and British and French missiles, did not disturb the military balance in Europe. In spite of that, the United States and NATO started deploying Pershing-2s and cruise missiles on the pretext of the “arms upgrading.” An additional nuclear threat was posed to the Soviet Union and its allies. If we had not signed the treaty and the Americans had continued fulfilling their program to deploy intermediate-range missiles, a situation might have taken shape whereby the United States had more such missiles in Europe. That would have forced us, in the interests of ensuring our security, to take countermeasures, and the arms race would thus have continued ad infinitum and the situation in Europe and in the world would have been seriously complicated.

Consequently, the point is not in the figures alone—although they have considerable importance—or in who has won or lost. Both sides compromised with each other. The United States, for example, agreed to eliminate U.S. nuclear warheads for the West German Pershing-1A missiles in the FRG, renounced the conversion of ground-based cruise missiles into sea-based ones, and agreed to determine the range of ballistic and cruise missiles in full-scale tests instead of the complex technical formula they suggested [as published]. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary pointed out, each side conceded exactly as much as was needed to balance their interests in the given specific sphere. As a result, we have a treaty that is based on taking account of mutual interests. The fact that real nuclear disarmament has been started on our initiative is, primarily, to the Soviet Union's credit and a great political and moral gain which has strengthened our international prestige even more.

I think it necessary to stress yet another circumstance. The treaty submitted for ratification is a document which we have analyzed deeply and comprehensively; literally each of its points has been weighed; it is not the fruit of activity by some individuals but the result of work by whole collectives. One could say without exaggeration that each word and each figure have been examined and checked in the most thorough manner. Questions relating to our own security were, of course, at the basis of this great deal of work. They were in the forefront. Would the elimination of intermediate-and shorter-range missiles not affect our security? In the nuclear space age, when the sides already have up to several thousand nuclear weapons which, if put into operation, harbor the threat of a universal catastrophe, security cannot endlessly be based only on increasing nuclear weapons, on fear of retribution.

In connection with this, the USSR Ministry of Defense considers that elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, as an important frontier in international

development, will make it possible to reduce the level of the military threat and tension and, consequently, to enhance our security and that of the other socialist states.

The Soviet Union is firmly intent upon further realistic accords on disarmament issues. But, like every other country, we naturally have a wholly responsible concern for our own security, too. The CPSU Central Committee and the Central Committee Politburo devote unremitting attention to the defense capability of our motherland and the fighting strength of the Soviet Armed Forces. The Soviet Army and Navy have at their disposal modern weapons and equipment, well-trained personnel, and command and political cadres, that are trained and devoted selflessly to the people. It should be understood that intermediate- and shorter-range missiles are not the only things guaranteeing the defense capability of our motherland and its allies: there are other military means, too, which reliably ensure our defense.

I can firmly assert that with the treaty's entry into force, the defense capability of the Soviet Union will be at a level such as to enable the peaceful labor of the Soviet people to be reliably defended.

A quantitative arms reduction will undoubtedly require us to undertake the necessary measures to improve our armed forces. But we have no intention of competing with the West in the creation [sozdaniye] of specific types of weapons. We are selecting those measures which will ensure the security of the Soviet Union and its allies. We are devoting a great deal of attention to enhancing the troops' combat readiness and combat effectiveness and to perfecting their management.

We will exert every effort to make the military alliance of the socialist countries, the Warsaw Pact Organization, ever more powerful and to make the joint defense of the socialist states even stronger. Comrade deputies! In studying the treaty submitted for your examination, you could not fail to notice what a major role it allocates to matters of guaranteeing reliable monitoring [kontrol] of fulfillment by both parties of the obligations adopted. We attach important significance to this problem, because attempts have been made, and are being made, by the United States to evade the precise fulfillment of its obligations and to circumvent the provisions of previously concluded Soviet-U.S. accords in arms limitation. Provisions are laid down in the treaty on the broad utilization of various kinds of on-site inspections. It can be said that there is provision for a graded package of inspections, encompassing all stages of implementing the treaty, verification [proverka] of initial data on existing weapons, observation of the process of elimination and the remaining systems which have still not been dismantled, and checking that there should be no production of weapons encompassed by the treaty. The inspection measures which are provided for, in conjunction with national technical means of verification [kontrol], allow both us and the Americans to be assured of the reliability of compliance with the treaty.

The experience of elaborating measures and methods of verification [kontrol] for intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is unique, but it can also be used in other Soviet-U.S. arms limitation agreements. In connection with the fact that we have rather more missiles subject to elimination, the Americans will carry out a correspondingly greater number of inspections. We are currently conducting preparations for carrying out inspections at U.S. facilities and the facilities in third countries connected with U.S. intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

Such inspections will allow us to convince ourselves of the authenticity of their information, and of compliance with the provisions of the treaty by the U.S. side. The inspections provided for by the treaty make serious demands on the corresponding military organizations and factories manufacturing missiles. Their task is once again to think through and implement the whole package of measures connected with implementation by the U.S. side of inspections on our territory, to guarantee unfailing, precise, and prompt fulfillment of the obligations laid upon the party receiving the inspection in accordance with the treaty.

A considerable amount of work also lies ahead in achieving the elimination of the missiles and the equipment and installations connected with them. This task focuses primarily on the Ministry of Defense. We can report to you, esteemed comrades, that the preparatory work on implementation of the tasks imposed on the Ministry of Defense is being conducted vigorously and will be completed by the set deadline. The necessary instructions have been issued to the troops. All the measures for preparing and implementing the provisions of the treaty have been put under supervision. Measures are being taken to organize close cooperation with local soviet and party bodies and also with other ministries and departments.

I would like to stress in particular that it is intended as much as possible to assign for use in the national economy the equipment remaining after the implementation of the procedure of elimination envisaged by the treaty. As is well-known, the treaty envisages the elimination of the missiles' front sections minus nuclear warhead devices. In this the front sections are crushed or flattened. The sides' actions regarding nuclear warhead devices are not governed by the treaty. Each side may use the fissionable materials at its own discretion, including for peaceful purposes after processing.

As is known, the CPSU Central Committee, by agreement with the leadership of the GDR and CSSR, adopted the decision, without waiting for the treaty to be ratified, to remove from the territories of those countries the Soviet operational and tactical missiles stationed [razmeshchenn] there in response to the deployment of U.S. intermediate-range missiles in Western Europe. I report that the necessary work is being done to implement this decision and they, these missiles, will be

withdrawn within the established time limits. As a whole, comrade deputies, the USSR Ministry of Defense is ready to fulfil exactly on schedule all the requirements dictated by the provisions of the treaty.

What is causing a certain amount of concern is the fact that, apparently, the prospects of the elimination of Soviet and U.S. missiles in Europe have not been to the liking of certain NATO figures. We do not fail to notice it when they talk about compensations and plans for the additional deployment of air-based or sea-based nuclear weapons on the territory of Europe or in the seas and oceans bordering it, and with a range prohibited for ground-based missiles. All these measures are designed to undermine the results of the Washington meeting. They show yet again that the most reactionary forces of imperialism are not relinquishing attempts to try to achieve military superiority for their own benefit and to keep the world in a state of constant tension. However, it is time that those who determine such a policy of the NATO bloc ponder the futility of attempts to achieve military superiority over the Warsaw Pact Organization.

The allied socialist countries themselves are not striving to achieve military superiority, but nor will they accept that anyone else has such a right. We fundamentally reject the policy of military superiority. This has been frequently stated by the leaders of our fraternal socialist states and by our Soviet Government.

The Soviet Armed Forces wholly and fully approve of the accord reached at summit level in Washington. We are convinced that steps must continue to be taken to reduce the level of military confrontation, taking into account the guaranteeing of mutual and equal security of the sides at all stages of disarmament. For this reason we support the efforts of the CPSU Central Committee and of the Soviet Government to achieve accord on the problem of major 50-percent reductions in strategic offensive weapons, in conditions where the ABM Treaty is observed in the form in which it was adopted in 1972, and also on other areas in the field of disarmament.

In our evaluation, the bringing into force of the treaty between the USSR and the United States on elimination of their intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is in accordance with the military-political situation and with the interests of the Soviet Union. In connection with this, I consider that the above treaty may be ratified by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The minister answered questions from Deputies E.K. Visotskis and L. Kh. Rasulova.

Question: How is it proposed to resolve the cadre problems which might arise in our armed forces in connection with the arms reduction?

Answer: There will be no such problems. Naturally, with the elimination of the missiles a certain number of troops will also be liable to be reduced. Conscripted

personnel will be reduced. Officers who have completed their set terms of service will be dismissed from the Army with appropriate pension provision and other benefits. The remaining officers will be left without work, and service in the armed forces will provided for them.

Question: It is known that one of the chief arguments of opponents of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles in the West is the claim that the Warsaw Pact Organization has a great advantage over NATO in conventional arms and armed forces. Are there any grounds for claims of this kind?

Answer: There are no grounds for claims in the West of the Warsaw Pact's great superiority over NATO in conventional arms and armed forces. However, there are certain imbalances. The NATO leaders purposely over-emphasize the Warsaw Pact's superiority in individual elements of arms, pulling them out of the overall correlation of forces, for example, the number of tanks. But they deliberately keep quiet about the NATO superiority in the number of tactical assault aircraft. These are F-111, F-16, F-15, and other aircraft (in all, roughly 1,500 units more), and also in antitank means, which compensates for the superiority in tanks.

NATO has superiority in naval forces, particularly in aircraft carrier strike formations.

But if you do not compare military potentials selectively but assess them comprehensively, then approximate equilibrium is apparent between the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO.

Regarding asymmetry and imbalances, we are prepared to sit down at the negotiating table and agree to eliminate them on a mutual basis, with due regard for both sides' security. We are prepared to examine and resolve this question on this condition.

Ligachev Comparison

Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian on 10 February carries in its Second Edition on page 1 the speech by Yegor Ligachev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, at a session of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet Council of the Union and Council of Nationalities in the Kremlin Hall of the Council of Nationalities on 9 February. The KRASNAYA ZVEZDA version, under the general headline "From Confrontation to Peaceful Coexistence," has been compared with the Moscow Television Service version published in the 9 February Soviet Union Daily Report, page 1, revealing the following variations:

page 1: column one, paragraph three, sentence one reads: ...the fulfillment of our responsible duties, I. (substituting "our" for "my")

column one, paragraph four, sentence one reads: ...and enterprising efforts supported by the fraternal socialist countries. Note, however, should...(adding passage)

column one, paragraph four, sentence three reads: ..of realistically-thinking politicians and other countries...(omitting "in the West")

column two, paragraph one, sentence two reads: ...to inform you that since the treaty was signed a large number...(rewording)

page 2: column one, paragraph one, only sentence reads: ...ties, and altogether by an improvement...(omitting phrase)

column one, paragraph four, sentence one reads: ...of its implementation. In addition to...(omitting phrase)

same paragraph, sentence four reads: ...Naturally, we must treat the views of representatives of the Soviet public with full responsibility and with full attention. Proceeding from this, the commission will eventually formulate its conclusion, which shall then be presented to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. (omitting phrase, rewording)

column two, last paragraph is omitted.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA omits vocative "comrades" throughout.

Shevardnadze Correction, Comparison

Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian on 10 February carries in its Second Edition on pages 1-3 the speech by Eduard Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR foreign minister, at a session of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet Council of the Union and Council of Nationalities in the Kremlin Hall of the Council of Nationalities on 9 February. The KRASNAYA ZVEZDA version, under the general headline "From Confrontation to Peaceful coexistence," has been compared with the Moscow Television Service version published in the 9 February Soviet Union Daily Report, page 2, revealing the following variations:

page 2, column two, paragraph one, sentence one reads: Esteemed Comrade Deputies! The government has...(omitting sentence two)

page 2, column two, paragraph one, last sentence reads: ...the United States is to destroy 859 of these missiles. Thus the USSR and the United States will no longer...(providing dropped passage)

page 3, column one, paragraph four, sentence four reads: ...subject of the talks—and with subjective...(rewording)

column one, paragraph five, sentence one reads: ...destroying their land-based cruise missiles by converting...(adding "cruise")

page 4, column two, line ten reads: short flight time. Incidentally, our own intermediate-range and operational and tactical missiles, which were aimed at targets in West Europe, have the same qualities. So the situation is identical here also.

Fourth, the question...(rewording)

column two, paragraph one, sentence three reads: ...not be there.

In addition, by agreeing to eliminate our intermediate- and shorter-range missiles in the Asian part of our country, we have taken a step toward states in the Asia and Pacific region, toward eliminating worries, groundless though they may be.

Also we are...(reparagraphing, inserting additional passage)

page 5, column one, sentence three reads: ...is prepared to undertake real cutbacks in existing advantages in individual...(rewording)

column one, paragraph two, last sentence reads: ...Belgium, and the Netherlands.

In the course of the 11 December 1987 meeting of leaders of Warsaw Pact states in Berlin the USSR, GDR, and CSSR foreign ministers signed an agreement on inspections linked with the Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. We are grateful to these allied states which supported with practical actions a treaty which, as the Berlin meeting noted, is of great importance for strengthening the security of socialist states.

The Soviet Union is also exchanging notes with five West European countries, and this will enable our inspectors to visit relevant U.S. military installations on their territories. As of today the USSR has exchanged such notes with Britain, Italy, and the Netherlands. Notes will be exchanged with the FRG and Belgium in the very near future. The United States has arranged similar procedures with respect to its own allies and the GDR and the CSSR.

By virtue of a law dated 6 July 1978 the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs is entrusted with overall observance of the fulfillment of international treaties concluded by the Soviet Union. The ministry is thoroughly preparing itself for the performance of this responsible task as applied to the Treaty on Intermediate and Shorter-Range Missiles.

The Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles is of paramount importance not only on the military, political plane. The signing of this treaty has equally great importance in the context of creating a favorable

backdrop for the solution of regional problems as well. Confirmation of this is provided by the convincing and heartfelt statement by M.S. Gorbachev on Afghanistan. It is an example of the spirit of the new time, of goodwill, and of realism in looking at things.

The statement by Najibullah, president of the Republic of Afghanistan, is in the same direction.

The treaty's implementation will also make a specific contribution to the process of restructuring which is spreading through our country and has embraced all aspects of the Soviet people's life.

The treaty shows, first...(adding passage and rewording)

column two, last paragraph reads: ...increase in the proportion of other components...(substituting "proportion" for "role")

page 6, column one, paragraph two, sentence one reads: ...to growing anxiety. The United States,...(omitting sentence)

column two, line seven reads: a world without wars.

Deputy V.I. Fedosov addressed a question to the minister.

V.I. Fedosov: Eduard Amvrosiyevich, in the capitals of NATO countries, to judge by mass media reports, an active discussion is taking place on the question of building up nuclear systems which are not included in the Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. A possibility is thus emerging for building up additional nuclear potentials by way of compensation for the cruise and Pershing missiles due to be dismantled. Does our treaty provide any guarantees against such circuitous ways of building up arms?

Answer: I will try to answer laconically, since Yegor Kuzmich already spoke about this in his introductory statement. I also tried to outline our position in my report. But I do understand your concern. Indeed, much is being said in the West now about compensation and about arms upgrading in connection with the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. This certainly gives us serious cause for worry. Our allies are also worried. I emphasized in my speech that now it is very important to maintain the dynamism and to prevent a serious break in the disarmament process. If there were to be any serious breaks in this process, a perfectly unexpected development of events would be possible. Thus, it is very important to ensure that this process proceeds without holdups.

The treaty itself does not limit nuclear and other systems which are not subject to its effect. But it does create sound conditions to ensure the achievement of progress

and to achieve arms reductions along other avenues: in the spheres of nuclear, conventional, and chemical arms. (report ends; rewording to provide alternate final passage)

Commission Proceedings

LD091514 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0805 GMT 9 Feb 88

[Concluding part of proceedings at session of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Council of the Union and Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, held to discuss ratification of the INF Treaty, in the Kremlin Hall of the Council of Nationalities; speakers introduced by Yegor Ligachev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member—live]

[Excerpts][Ligachev] Allow me to hand the platform to Comrade Vladimir Sevastyanovich Stepanov, member of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Council of Nationalities and Karelian Party Obkom first secretary. Afterward we want to hand the platform to Comrade Sagdeyev.

[Stepanov] Comrade deputies! There has not been a single international event of recent times that has attracted such intense and interested attention as the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. [passage omitted]

We deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet, like all Soviet people, know well that an acute and complicated political struggle is developing over the question of ratification of the Soviet-U.S. treaty inside and outside the U.S. Congress. The opponents of ratification of the treaty are demanding that the arms race be continued in other areas. In connection with this, it seems to me it would be purposeful at our session of the commissions of the chambers today to form a preparatory commission from among the members of the foreign affairs commissions for the examination of the whole set of problems connected with the treaty and its ratification, and for the drafting of recommendations for the foreign affairs commissions of the chambers. This commission would be able to listen to experts on the foreign economic, foreign policy, military, financial and economic, ecological, and other aspects of the treaty. Thus it seems to me that such a preparatory commission would play an important role in preparations for further actions by our foreign affairs commissions of the chambers.

Thank you for your attention.

[Ligachev] Thank you. Permit me to invite Comrade Roald Zinnuyrovich Sagdeyev, Foreign Affairs Commission member and Space Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences director, to take the floor. I shall then call on Comrade Zakharov from Leningrad.

[Sagdeyev] Esteemed deputies! Comrades! We are not just witnesses but direct participants in an outstanding historic process, the turning back of the nuclear arms race. This places a particular responsibility on the work of our commissions. It is necessary to consider from all angles such a complex and important document as the treaty on the elimination of two classes of missiles by the USSR and the United States. Is it possible to assess more accurately the consequences of this agreement? You know that in recent years, wider and wider circles of scientists in many countries have been taking part in various movements for peace, for disarmament, and for the survival of mankind. Soviet scientists, too, are playing an active role in these movements. We have made a whole series of detailed analyses of the development of the arms race and those measures which are necessary to put an end to nuclear madness.

I must say that the signing of the treaty on intermediate- and lower-range missiles has been received by Soviet scientists, and indeed by the world scientific community as a whole, with great satisfaction. The hand of the symbolic clock showing how close mankind is to the danger point, on the cover of the famous international journal of nuclear scientists, has been pulled a few minutes back as a result of the signing of the treaty. Who better than scientists can assess the fatal, tragic consequences of a devastating thermonuclear war for everything living on earth? It is said, it is alleged, that the INF Treaty is of no serious military significance, since the arsenal of nuclear warheads existing at present in the world is only being reduced by 4 percent. Yes, we do not conceal that we would prefer not by 4 percent, but to 4 percent. But let us take this first step. Granted it is quite modest quantitatively, but it denotes a qualitative breakthrough in nuclear thinking, in nuclear strategy. Even 4 percent means tens of thousands of Hiroshimas. This much would be sufficient to destroy all of human civilization.

Comrade deputies! I urge that the supreme organ of Soviet power should support the most rapid ratification and subsequent implementation of the treaty. The treaty provides for the introduction of unprecedented and penetrating measures of on-site verification [kontrol]. As a space specialist, I should like to assure you that the adequacy of the verification will also be reliably backed up by the methods of space observation by national means, which have given good account of themselves. This is a sort of space glasnost.

At the same time, I want to confess that I continue to feel some unease about the NATO plans to continue the arms race in other directions, including new ones. After all, it is no secret, one can read it in the Western press, that having signed the intermediate- and shorter-range missile treaty, the United States and NATO are considering the possibility of redeploying their F-16 nuclear aircraft from Spain to Italy, nearer to the borders of the USSR and our allies. The NATO Command is proposing to deploy new nuclear missile complexes with a range of up

to 450 km in Western Europe. The United States has put binary chemical weapons into production, and work is continuing on the U.S. so-called Strategic Defense Initiative program, SDI. Finally, in spite of the signed treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, discussions are continuing on creating a Euro-SDI, which, as was confirmed earlier, was directed against Soviet intermediate- and shorter-range missiles which are now to be liquidated under the treaty. There is no doubt that such aspirations do not serve the aims for which the treaty was signed. It is therefore necessary once again from this platform to draw attention to these dangerous tendencies, which bring into question the sincerity of our partners in disarmament issue. We must evidently follow attentively such tendencies, which hamper progress along the whole front of disarmament negotiations. Thank you for your attention.

[Ligachev] Thank you. Allow me to give the floor to comrade Ivan Vasilyevich Zakharov, member of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Council of the Union and leader of a team of metal- and assembly-workers of the Leningrad Kirov Works production; I shall then give the floor to Comrade Aytmatov.

[Zakharov] Comrade deputies! The decision adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet presidium on 25 January this year notes that, thanks to the purposeful efforts of the Soviet Union and socialist countries, with the active backing of all peace-loving forces, as a result of successful dialogue between the leaders of the the USSR and the United States, including three Soviet-U.S. summit meetings, and strenuous diplomatic negotiations, mankind has arrived at a historic frontier between the increase of the nuclear threat and the disarmament of our planet. Indeed, an important moment in the history of civilization has dawned. [passage omitted]

Therefore, as a representative of the renowned Kirov workers' detachment, I say that we are in favor of ratification of the treaty. At the same time, I should like to be more specific about my attitude toward this document, and pose a number of questions which arose while it was being studied. In the first place, I do not consider that the labor of thousands of Soviet scientists, engineers, and workers which has been invested in developing complex and most up-to-date military technology has gone to waste. This was a measure we were compelled to take, aimed at modernizing armaments, taking account of the need to respond to the nuclear missiles threat from the West. Without these efforts, there would most likely not have been today's global double zero.

Secondly, the ratification of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles will make it possible to liberate manpower and production capacity and scarce raw materials for the manufacture of high-quality civilian production, of which our national economy is acutely in need. For it is no secret that the most highly qualified workers, engineers, and technicians are engaged on producing missile technology, and that the most up-to-date

equipment, the best raw and other materials are used for this. There are already instances of this: on February central television reported that the Votkinsk machine building works in the Udmurt SSR has substantially increased the output of "Feya" small washing machines, which are in great demand among the population.

Thirdly, it is a matter for satisfaction that, in drawing up the treaty on our side, a sensible and careful approach was shown to the fate of those elements of missile complexes which can be used in the interests of the national economy without giving rise to concern on the other side. [passage omitted]

Comrades, Leningraders who survived the blockade and who experienced all the burdens of World War II are well aware of the price of peace. For that very reason my electorate and I are pleased that the USSR Supreme Soviet is actively discussing the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. In the event that it comes into force, we are sure it will be strictly fulfilled by us. At the same time, it is a matter of some concern to us how the treaty will be implemented by the other side by the United States, which while this agreement was being drawn up tried to exclude from verification [kontrol] many installations connected with intermediate-range missiles on their own territory and on the territory of its allies. [passage omitted]

It appears that in the course of the forthcoming discussion, a careful examination will be made of all aspects of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles; and this, will, in its turn, make it possible rapidly and without unnecessary delay to ratify the treaty, which is indeed a historic document.

Thank you for your attention. [Ligachev] Allow me to give the floor to Chingiz Torekulovich Aytmatov, deputy and writer.

[Aytmatov] [passage omitted] Without restructuring and glasnost, without the new thinking, it would have been impossible, in my view, to attain such a level of trust and accord between the Soviet Union and the United States. If this is fate, then it has come just at the right time. It was a reciprocal movement by the sides toward a common goal, and the strength of fact lies in this. The world is now discussing how and in under what circumstances the sides will ratify the Soviet-U.S. treaty. Yes, it is an exceptionally important moment. It is important not to give in to the various kinds of enfeebling, cheapening, and nihilistic moods arising around such major historical events for perfectly understandable reasons.

In this connection I would like to say that we Soviet people have suffered our way to the treaty not easily and not lightly, passing through insights and lessons and perhaps even, as Mayakovskiy said, stepping on the throat of our own song. In this sense we also well understand the Americans. The present Soviet generations are unanimous in approving the treaty. A new

substance of sensible coexistence has opened up, though, it must be said, there are dissonant voices in our country which we cannot fail to take into account. It seems to some Soviet citizens that we have made greater concessions than we should have. Others think it is impermissible in general to rely on any assurances or agreements in these matters.

There is nothing to be surprised at here. The stereotype of the old thinking, which formed over years and decades under the influence of mutual enmity, mutually negative propaganda, the tireless arms race, all that which has complicated, impoverished and troubled the life of contemporary man, depriving him of many boons and opportunities and causing him many misfortunes and worries, and the psychological stresses and information squalls unleashed on him, cannot fail to take their toll, cannot fail to give rise to a certain reaction and to distrust. We, however, are more worried by what can be called the conscious promotion of a spell of disillusion by certain U.S. figures on the eve of the treaty's ratification by the relevant parliamentary bodies.

The idea of compensation has been put forward. What can be said about this? Naturally, everyone is free to act in line with his convictions, but one thing is clear. It is not only and not so much a matter of who has how many missiles, but of someone having to be first in the world to resolve to surmount the barrier of insuperability, for it is truly a question of to be or not to be. [passage omitted]

[Ligachev] Comrades, you and I have listened to the reports of ministers, Comrade Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze and Comrade Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov and also speeches by supreme Soviet deputies, Comrade Vladimir Sevastyanovich Stepanov, Comrade Roald Zinnurovich Sagdeyev, Comrade Ivan Vasilyevich Zakharov, and Comrade Chingiz Torekulovich Aytmatov. In addition, we have had the chance to ask questions and receive quite detailed answers. I believe we have every reason to say we have made a start on your work connected with examining and drafting a conclusion on the Soviet-U.S. treaty. Our comrades have succeeded in getting a very detailed idea of the substance of this treaty, and of its role and significance for the future of mankind.

At the same time, as you will have noted from the deputies' speeches, a proposal has been introduced to form a sort of working body within our joint Foreign Affairs commission of the Supreme Soviet—let us call it a preparatory commission—which will be assigned the task of making a quite detailed and comprehensive study of the Soviet-U.S. treaty, without haste but in a fairly intensive way. There are several matters that must be cleared up through meetings with experts and specialists, and on which the desires and remarks of the Soviet public must be heeded. I believe that in this way we will again fasten the attention of our whole people, our entire public and the whole of the world's progressive public on this extremely vital political document.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Now, if this proposal is acceptable, it would be possible to agree to this way of doing things. If anybody has any other proposals, let us discuss them. I imagine there will be more sessions ahead of us, but now let us give it the chance—or rather, let us set up such a working body and give it the chance to get down to detailed work. I sense there is unanimity among deputies and, since this is so, permit me to hand over to Central Committee Secretary Anatoliy Fedorovich Dobrynin to speak about the composition of the Preparatory Commission.

[Dobrynin] Comrade deputies! The following membership of the preparatory commission is submitted for your examination:

Comrade Aytmatov, deputy of the Soviet of Nationalities, author; Comrade Afanasyev, deputy of the Soviet of Nationalities, PRAVDA editor-in-chief; Comrade Blokhin, Soviet of Nationalities deputy, All-Union Oncological Scientific Center of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences director; Comrade Korniyenko, deputy of the Soviet of the Union, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department; Comrade Markov, deputy of the Soviet of the Union, USSR Union of Writers board chairman; Comrade Orlova, deputy of the Soviet of the Union, textile worker of the Moscow Trekhgornaya Manufaktura Combine; Comrade Sagdeyev, deputy of the Soviet of the Union, academician; Comrade Sklyarov, deputy of the Soviet of the Union, head of the Propaganda Department of the CPSU Central Committee; Fedosov, deputy of the Soviet of Nationalities, senior secretary of the Soviet Peace Committee; Comrade Chervonenko, deputy of the Soviet of Nationalities, a CPSU Central Committee department head.

Thus the two foreign affairs commissions are represented by an equal number of deputies: five from each commission. After you have approved the membership of the prepared [as heard] commission, the commission itself, at its session, will elect a chairman, and then draw up a schedule for its work. Thank you.

[Ligachev] Are there any additions or changes to the membership of the commission? If not, allow me to put it to the vote: Would those who wish to elect these deputies as members of the preparatory commission raise their hands? Down, please. Against? None. Abstentions? None. So we elect them unanimously as members of the preparatory commission.

As far as our further work is concerned, our second and other sessions of the commission, as the work of the preparatory commission progresses, we shall set the dates and inform you in advance. Please prepare for further discussion of the Soviet-U.S. treaty and the preparation of conclusions regarding it.

That, I think, is all that we planned to examine today. Are there any questions or comments relating to the carrying out of our work? If not, then we'll now have a

break of 10 or 15 minutes, after which we ask only the deputies of the Supreme Soviet to take part in the session. May I thank you, and wish you success.

"Studio 9" on Post-Summit World

OW060953 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0501 GMT 6 Feb 88

["Studio 9" program presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, Soviet television and radio political observer, with Professor Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, CPSU Central Committee International Department first deputy chief, and Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs and doctor of historical sciences]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. We meet in Studio 9 at Ostankino Television Center for our traditional talk dedicated to the topical problems of world politics. Today at our Studio 9 table are Professor Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, CPSU Central Committee International Department first deputy chief, and Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs and doctor of historical sciences.

Our talk in Studio 9 today is taking place at a time that is, from the international affairs point of view, certainly unusual. The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, the signing in Washington of an agreement to destroy two types of nuclear weapons, has created, to all intents and purposes, a new situation in the international arena, and become a kind of new starting point. Although it has been a long time since a single world political event has caused such a stream of commentary as was the case with the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, I still feel that perhaps not everyone fully understands the full meaning of what took place in Washington. Furthermore, I am not speaking only about the agreements signed there—even though these agreements are enormously significant, for it is actually the first time mankind was able to interrupt this dangerous onward march of accumulation of mountains of new weapons—but first of all we are speaking about the act of breaking familiar political stereotypes and familiar ways of thinking, which were formed over centuries, such as that which were regarded to be utopian or seen as being little more than propaganda rhetoric which are merely said and nobody really has any intention of fulfilling. Suddenly all this appeared as realistic policy with attainable goals. This of course has far-reaching consequences. Certainly one should not assume that a sharp turn has already been achieved or overestimate all that has happened. Perhaps the topic under discussion is not a turn but rather a demonstration of a possibility for such a turn. The way the political processes on the international arena develop in the future will determine whether or not this turn becomes real.

This topic, the world after Washington, is the topic I propose for our talk today. In connection with this I would like to formulate three questions, or if you wish,

one question with three parts. First, what are the possibilities demonstrated and prospects opened up by the Washington agreements? Second, is it realistic to expect a continuation of the process which has begun, and what obstructs it? And finally third, can one expect that these obstacles—be they objective or subjective in nature—can be overcome and how long will it take?

Vadim Valentinovich: let us begin our talk with an attempt to provide an answer, very briefly indeed, to these questions. Later we will examine several specific aspects of problems that may arise.

[Zagladin] All right. I feel the questions are truly important and interesting, but before answering them, something should first be said about why Washington became possible. In effect, this will provide an answer to the question about the trends that have appeared in this process and what can be expected in the future. In short, the following ideas can be formulated. First of all this agreement became possible because the very idea of it, the document itself, and its signing, reflects the vital and pressing need of humanity. Let me recall the old but often forgotten thoughts of Engels that militarism and weapons have their own dialectics of development, a dialectic that at the end will lead to, how would one put it, to its own denial. Not in the sense that it is no longer possible to create ever new types of arms, but in the sense that weapons reach a level at which they no longer can be goal-effective. That is, their use is no longer politically effective.

Lenin later developed this idea further. He said that weapons or war became so destructive that it becomes quite impossible. It is precisely this point that we have now reached. Weapons have reached a stage of their own denial, they have ceased to be the means of achieving any political goals whatsoever. The agreement, the idea for the agreement, has embodied the essence of this fact into practical politics and this, speaking philosophically, is the main reason for success.

Certainly, no objective reasons or processes can act entirely by themselves. A subjective factor, which is capable of comprehending the new reality and formulating or expressing it in terms of some kind of action, must be present. This subjective factor was present. That is, first of all, our policy, the policy of the Soviet Union. Obviously, we did not act entirely on our own. We always acted in conjunction with our fraternal socialist countries. This provided for large and new possibilities. Valentin Sergeyevich, you have already spoken of the appearance of a new form of thinking, that there has been a break in the old way of thinking. This process was very important because it created a situation which allowed for our ideas and proposals to come to fruition.

Certainly, it is very significant that during the time of the talks and during the time when questions were being decided, two political wills met or found each other. It would be wrong to think we alone played a role—though

certainly our initiatives were, after all, our initiatives—but the American side also displayed a will to reach an agreement. Mutually acceptable compromises were found without which not a single agreement could be reached today, nor could they be reached previously between such different sides.

Well, you spoke of a new starting point. I would say this is both true and false. Because there were several starting points. Take for example, the statement made on 15 January 1986. That was the starting point when the arm of the clock began ticking toward a nuclear-free world. Reykjavik was the second starting point when our proposals truly caused an upheaval in the thinking process. We said then, correctly as it turned out, that it is no longer possible to act in the old way. Finally, Washington itself was a new starting point.

Washington is a qualitatively new starting point, but not the first one it seems. What is new in it? First of all, the fact that the political climate has changed. It turned out that it was possible for problems to be solved, to try to reach decisions pertaining to the reduction of arms and to move forward. Will there be difficulties in the future? Undoubtedly. Generally, I feel the forthcoming period is not a period of euphoria nor flights of fancy, but rather, a period of very intensive work, much-needed work, although at times, for those involved, this work can be a boring, gray endeavor.

This period will be difficult because of course, forces acting this certainly do exist. There are those who still believe in the policy of force. I do not believe there are those who wish to unleash a war, but forces do exist that would seek to make use of force in terms of blackmail and of applying pressure. There are also forces who hope to tire us out by means of the arms race. There are forces who grow rich on this arms race. In other words, many alternatives exist. Already, these forces are creating problems. For example, after the agreement was reached, the idea of compensation for the losses suffered by NATO appeared, via the introduction of new nuclear systems or by modernizing the existing systems in Europe. In other words, certain difficulties are already beginning to appear. Admittedly, now they have become more difficult to create. Those who wish to create difficulties are finding it increasingly more difficult because the atmosphere has changed. But they will certainly continue.

[Zorin] Thank you. Let us now try to examine a few specific questions of recurring problems. Vadim Valentinovich has already come close to broaching these questions.

It is known that there is an agreement that the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting will take place in Moscow. Work is now going ahead in Geneva to prepare an agreement on a 50-percent reduction of strategic arms. I understand that at the present stage of work it is difficult

to speak in terms of achievements, but I would, nevertheless, like to ask, Vladimir Fedorovich, your opinion on how you evaluate the possibility of reaching agreement during the course of the present talks in Geneva and at the same time, what is your evaluation of the prospects for a Soviet-U.S. agreement in Moscow?

[Petrovskiy] Indeed, talks on nuclear and space weapons are now taking place in Geneva, and at the center of attention at these talks is the question of reaching agreement on the 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms with simultaneous adherence to the ABM Treaty, in the form in which it was signed in 1972. These talks began on 14 January and it should be candidly said that we feel that difficulties are now beginning to appear. Moreover, these difficulties are created by the U.S. side, and the latest reports which we receive daily attest to the fact that a trend is developing in the U.S. side toward retreating from the Reykjavik agreements and from the latest agreements reached in Washington.

[Zorin] Even from the Washington agreements?

Vladimir Fedorovich, another question. I noticed that very often a difference exists between the position of those representatives of the United States who sit at the conference table in Geneva and the leaders of U.S. foreign policy. What is going on here?

[Petrovskiy] There is probably a subjective factor. Now Vadim Valentinovich recalled that the subjective factor plays its role in politics and is manifested both in the political and the diplomatic levels. But in the long run the main thing depends on the line and political course of the leadership and how consistently it is implemented in practical matters.

[Zorin] Vladimir Fedorovich, another question for you. Does the problem of verification play a role in those difficulties that are presently arising in Geneva that you have mentioned?

[Petrovskiy] Undoubtedly, the questions of verification occupy an important place at the talks in Geneva and these are by no means easy questions to solve. Moreover, it is one matter when verification concerns complete elimination of entire classes of nuclear weapons, as for example is the case with intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, and quite another matter when verification concerns the elimination of nuclear arsenals by 50 percent. But nevertheless, what has now been achieved in the course of talks on an agreement on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles creates a model for verification which is unprecedented in its nature, its scope, and its effectiveness.

Just take a look at the system of verification that is being established as a result of realization of the agreement on IRM and SRM [intermediate- and shorter range missiles]. For instance, according to this agreement, Soviet inspectors must, over a period of 13 years, carry out

permanent verification over the production of Pershing-2 missiles at the U.S. Hercules Plant No 1 in Magna, Utah. Besides, our inspectors will have the right to take measurements, to weigh products passing out of the plant, to use X-ray equipment, and, in accordance with the agreement, to open containers carrying missiles eight times a year to ensure that systems banned by the treaty are not leaving the plant.

This is only one form of verification, whereas six various kinds of inspection are envisaged. Besides, inspections will be carried out in accordance with the agreement not only on the territory of the United States. Our inspectors will also visit the territories of the FRG, Great Britain, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands. Naturally, inspections will also be carried out regarding the Soviet Union. This shows the detailed nature of the system of verification worked out for application to these two classes of missiles, and I think this system of verification can serve as a model, a prototype of how questions regarding verification of strategic offensive arms should be solved as well.

There is another, psychological side of the matter, I would say. Insofar as it was possible to solve this issue so rapidly, then I think that with a presence of political will and with a consistent policy, the problems of verification can be also solved regarding strategic offensive arms.

[Zorin] I understand. Now if you would excuse my professional persistence—of course it was distressing to hear such an assessment of the latest events in Geneva from you—but I would like to ask: Do you personally consider it possible that a common platform will be found that will provide an opportunity to reach agreement by the summer of this year on a 50-percent reduction in strategic arms of our countries?

[Petrovskiy] Well, as far as I am concerned personally, from experience gained in participating in talks, I would say that if there is a presence of political will it will be possible to ensure preparation of an agreement by the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. meeting in Moscow. There are grounds for this. Just take a look. First of all, the Soviet and U.S. leaders have issued quite precise and clear instructions in this regard for the talks in Geneva. Secondly, a draft agreement on this issue is already available in Geneva. Of course there are many things to be cleared up in it, but there is such a document.

Finally, the most important thing that the example of preparations for the IRM-SRM agreement shows is that complex and very difficult questions can be solved when there is a will to do so. Anyway, I must say that as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it fully intends to do everything possible to see that the Washington agreements are implemented in practical matters and are implemented as soon as possible before the Soviet-U.S. meeting.

[Zagladin] Valentin Sergeyevich, although you asked Vladimir Fedorovich this question, I would like to express my point of view. Of course it is very difficult to estimate the chances here. But as far as the agreement on a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms is concerned, I agree with what has been said. But there is another problem, the problem of adherence to the ABM Treaty. It seems to me that there will be difficulties here that will be somewhat greater than with the 50-percent reduction, even if only because the draft agreement proposed by the U.S. side, even in its title, contradicts the ABM Treaty, insofar as it envisages a turn by both sides toward the creation of new defensive weapons.

I think we will have more problems here. So if there is a possibility of progress with the 50 percent, even greater political will will be needed here to achieve progress.

[Petrovskiy] Quite right, particularly because here we are talking about solving these issues as an organic whole, because adherence to the ABM Treaty guarantees the strategic stability that would permit a radical reduction of strategic offensive arms.

[Zorin] Now in connection with this I would like to draw the attention of our television viewers to the fact that the events we are talking about have one very important specific feature. They are occurring at the height of the election campaign that has begun in the United States. Valentin Valentinovich, you mentioned the ABM Treaty. I do not want to make guesses, but it is a fact that the SDI is the favorite brainchild of the current President, a President whose term in office runs out in several months. Now what the next president's attitude to this project will be is a topic of much conjecture in the United States. Moreover, the present administration—it is a fact—is presently in a special hurry to undertake a series of steps aimed at tying up the next administration, which would deny it the possibility of retreating from this issue.

Now there are many serious doubts in the United States over the SDI program, over its capabilities: whether or not it can be created, its economic feasibility, and so forth. In other words, this is linked with the political struggle that is already underway in connection with who the next president will be. Furthermore, the election campaign introduces a certain provisional element. The conventions of the Democratic and Republican parties will be in July and August, the elections in November. Consequently, the present administration has only this time, this period before the conventions, and no more, to make decisions. Afterward, for several months, all will be involved with purely domestic political problems.

Finally, I must say there is also another mitigating factor here. The fact that President Reagan is interested in completing his term in office with a major foreign policy success—there is no doubt about this—apparently has a certain influence. But I am not certain that his opponents, say from the Democratic Party, and even his

colleagues from the Republican Party, are so eager to present him with this gift rather than keep it for themselves, moreover since Reagan's legacy, particularly in the economic sphere, will be quite a burden for the next U.S. president. He is interested in some kind of balance, in somehow balancing these difficulties. Therefore the election campaign that has begun affects everything that we have spoken of here, and I wanted to note this.

The results of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Washington naturally have the most significant influence on the situation throughout the world. It is not a problem of bilateral relations alone. It is a situation that has led to a new climate in the world, and I would now like to dwell on the political situation in Europe after Washington. Now Vadim Valentinovich, how would you assess the influence of the Soviet-U.S. agreements that have been reached on the political process in Europe? [Zagladin] I must say that in Europe these changes, this serious progress, began before Washington. Washington did not start this, but rather acted as a catalyst in these processes. Even before Washington a powerful fermentation began in Europe, a fermentation of ideas and thoughts due to different circumstances. Above all, European countries, at least many of them, embarked on the path of activating their scientific and technical policies, the augmentation of their scientific and technical potential. They achieved a great deal.

Usually when we speak of this we think of Japan and the United States, but progress is being achieved in Europe as well. Nor is it insignificant. Europe is rapidly becoming an increasingly serious economic and scientific and technical giant—mainly the FRG, and Italy is making its presence felt, as well as others. This is already beginning to change the correlation of forces with other centers of power in the capitalist world. Further, in the political sphere, the Europeans, with the passage of time, are given increased thought to their own roles, their own opportunities. This is hardly surprising, because on the whole they tended to underestimate themselves to a certain extent.

On our part, if we too were prone to this kind of underestimation to some extent in the past, the turning point for this was the 27th CPSU Congress which announced the European direction as one of the main directions. There was also a certain assessment, which was essentially also an underestimate, made by the United States, which viewed and to some extent still views Europe simply as a faithful bearer of arms and an ally. Only recently they perceived Europe as an economic competitor and as a force that also has its own political interests. Certain things pertaining to this began to change in the United States. But the Europeans felt and perceived that the relationship of the United States with Europe was not the one that they would have chosen to have.

On the one hand, there were many in Europe who felt—one can often feel this during conversations—that Reykjavik and Geneva represent, to some extent, an attempt

by the two great powers or superpowers to bypass the Europeans and to reach some form of agreement behind their backs. As far as we are concerned this is by no means true, because we hold consultations with the Europeans and we brief them on all the steps we take. It should be said that Washington too has now begun making a practice of consulting and briefing. Thus, we do not wish to do anything behind Europe's back. But the feeling still remains.

Washington itself has shown that yes, the two major powers have learned to solve some of the problems. What about us? There are problems that Europe is directly interested in. If we are to discuss what Washington has given Europe, then it must be this stimulus to think in this way. Especially, since Washington, from the point of view of security, has changed the very situation in Europe. Previously the main talks were held between the USSR and the United States—Geneva, IRM-SRM, strategic offensive weapons, ABM—the Europeans did not take part in these talks. Now, one agreement has been reached. Talks are being conducted on the second one. ABM is also being discussed. But, under these conditions, other problems are coming to the fore—chemical weapons, conventional weapons, further ways to promote measures of confidence in the military sphere, and so forth. Here Europe is taking an active part. The West Europeans are already saying that after the intermediate-range missiles have been eliminated the question of conventional arms has to be resolved. We are not against this, we are for this. We have always said, and are saying this now, that we are ready, that our proposals have been made, the detailed proposals will be made as soon as talks begin, but for the time being no mandate has been received. The Vienna meeting has not, as yet, provided it. The Europeans have now felt the need for, if not independence then at least their own ideas, their own actions. They felt that their role in the policy of security is changing and growing.

[Petrovskiy] I would like to say that a characteristic phenomenon has now appeared on the European political horizon, after the Soviet-American summit in Washington. This phenomenon, in my opinion, consists of the fact that presently not only thoughts are beginning to sprout in Europe—which is in itself important, this idea of a common European house which is becoming essentially very acceptable to all European states—but what I think is also very important is that evidence of a new type of state behavior is becoming apparent. This is already being manifested in practical politics.

Recently there was a visit by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov to Sweden and Norway. We carried with us a whole series of ideas which set out the Murmansk initiative of Comrade Gorbachev, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on making the north a zone of peace, on significantly strengthening the northern parameters of a system of universal security. These ideas

fell on fertile soil. Our proposals on beginning military consultations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO on limiting naval fleet activities in northern seas are being studied with great interest.

In any case, the public has enthusiastically received these proposals and one would wish that the same positive reply will come from the capitals to which these proposals were sent.

We also felt the practical results during the visit of our minister of foreign affairs to the FRG and to Spain. Take, for example, the way the problems of vital importance to Europe were discussed during the visit, problems relating to limiting arms and reducing the level of military confrontation. Essentially, our concept of further immediate steps in this sphere has been accepted and shared. It is gratifying to note, for example, that the FRG, like the Soviet Union, is very actively speaking out now in favor of eliminating chemical weapons and signing, as early as this year, a convention on this matter.

Certainly, the question has long been ripe for solution. I would say that all questions have been 90 percent resolved. The matter now lies with the United States and France who are creating various, and I might add, artificial excuses to slow down the progress of this convention. But I think the support of the European countries, as well as all the other member states of the international community, could become a very powerful factor for the realization of this convention. I cited the chemical convention merely as a specific example of how European countries are behaving in a very active and responsible way. These actions can also be seen in other areas.

[Zagladin] Vladimir Fedorovich, I think that you are certainly right that there are new forms of behavior sprouting. Certainly, this is the case. You also gave good examples. I should add that when speaking about Sweden it should be noted that this is a country that has long proposed and expressed its readiness to search out and follow a new path. To a known extent, Norway has done likewise. Indeed, new phenomena have appeared in the FRG, and this deserves full support....

[Zorin interrupts] Vadim Valentinovich, I have a question for you here. Truly this is a new phenomenon. I quite agree that the results of Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze's visit to the FRG and Strauss's visit to Moscow speak of some new processes. But I do wish to ask you a question. First, why, in your opinion, did Bonn's position change so sharply and rapidly, and second, the change was so sharp and rapid that naturally a question arises: Can one take this at face value?

[Zagladin] Why do you speak of a sharp turn? One ought to remember that the policy of the FRG, its political course, has a sufficiently serious history. But I wish to say that roots do exist, roots such as agreements, further agreements with the FRG, a system of agreements

between the FRG and other socialist countries. That is the foundation was laid by the Social Democratic-Liberal coalition, the foundation that used to be called the New Eastern Policy.

This was not simply a Social Democratic course. No, it was a course which took its cue from lessons learned from the national history of Germany in the past and the lessons of the post-war period, a realization that a confrontationist, militaristic course is, on the whole, contrary to the interest of the country. This was done by the Social Democratic-Liberal coalition, and the new coalition, when it came to power, stated that it would continue with this line. Admittedly, later there were certain retreats and waverings. This did indeed happen. The forces of old thinking in this case were attempting to retreat from the line which in fact had already shown its successes.

[Zorin interrupts] This is what I had in mind.

[Zagladin] But it became apparent here that these retreats do not bring positive results. The FRG is far from being in a simple position because economically it is one of the more powerful countries in Western Europe and has substantial potential. In the political sphere, however, it remains fairly restricted because its position, its political role, still does not correspond to its economic capabilities, its historic role, and so forth. But how to increase the political role of the country? This is the question that the West German politicians had to face. There are many among them who are realistic thinkers, even though some are conservative and reactionary in their ideas, but nevertheless they are realistic people who understood that retreating to some old courses will bring little reward and prevent the FRG from increasing its political role. Increasing the FRG's political role becomes feasible only under new conditions in Europe, under Helsinki conditions or conditions of the new European house. Obviously, this is understood differently, perhaps not the way we or others understand it, they have their own concept of a European house and the choice they made brought them to this position.

This does not mean that the FRG is retreating from NATO or from the alliance with the United States, but it does signify an attempt, an aspiration, on the basis of more realistic options, to find ways to increase their country's role and to give it an opportunity to increase its influence in European politics and, for that matter, in the whole world.

[Zorin] In short, what you are saying is that there are objective factors underlying this?

[Zagladin] I think that undoubtedly there are objective factors underlying this. Although the motives for these actions may be quite different, the actions themselves are consistent with the interests of building a peaceful Europe and deserve all support.

[Petrovskiy] Perhaps Vadim Valentinovich, when speaking about the FRG, it should be taken into consideration that the political and economic circles of the FRG are very attentively watching the processes of restructuring that are taking place in our country...

[Zorin, interrupting] Everybody is watching this.

[Petrovskiy] Everyone, but here they are watching with particular attention from an economic point of view for the types of economic opportunities and prospects that are opening up, and many of circles in this country, independent of their political orientations, are attentively watching for opportunities to develop constructive cooperation...

[Zagladin, interrupting] Vladimir Fedorovich, I would like to return to one of the old... rather, a thought expressed earlier about the sprouts of new activity and the pressure of old thinking. All in all, the pressure of old thinking on many points is still felt. Specifically, for example, the document of the West European Union which was adopted in October last year. What is it? It is a security concept, but a security in which the military rather than the political factor predominates. This is the reluctance to abandon the habits formed by centuries and millenniums. Further, this concept of compensation for the intermediate-range missiles which arose in the United States, is also now making its way across Europe and is acquiring most unexpected forms.

There are those who demand that new tactical weapons be introduced in almost twice the number of intermediate- and short-range missiles that are being taken out, while on the other hand, there is the intention to transfer the F-16's, previously deployed in Spain, to Italy. If this should take place I will be greatly surprised because the policy of the Italian leadership and the Italian foreign policy leadership was very well-thought-through and in many instances, very realistic. This point of view was gratifying. It was a contribution to the common cause of building a European house. But this action would of course diverge from this. But you yourself mentioned the position of France with regard to chemical weapons. One could add Vienna, their line there is also not the most constructive.

[Zorin] In connection with this, I have a question for you, Vadim Valentinovich. What is the matter? What has happened with France? This is how I would put it. Why is it that recently France has adopted a position on many issues, some of which have been mentioned today, that is on the extreme right wing of European politics? What is happening?

[Zagladin] Perhaps one should not say the extreme right wing, for it is not quite accurate. France does have positions that correspond with those of the other countries and fit into the framework of peaceful European politics, the peace policy. There are quite a few points of coincidence, where they are either identical or close. But

there are points that do not fit. This includes the future of French nuclear arms, which has already been discussed, this pertains to the question of chemical weapons, and Vienna to some extent, and so forth.

Why? The fact is that France, from the economic point of view, is far from occupying first place in Europe. Its positions are not very strong. From the political point of view, the same applies because a number of large powers exist in Europe—Great Britain, the FRG, Italy, and Spain which is playing an ever-increasing role—and the smaller countries of Europe are beginning to become politically active partners in common European politics. The role of France in this is also not too significant, especially if we consider that its economic position is somewhat weak in comparison to its neighbors.

What remains? What remains are weapons. France is a nuclear power, and I think that the French position on the question of nuclear weapons is inspired not only by the thought that it needs it as a deterrent. After all, no one intends to attack France, and there is no one on our side intending to commit any aggression whatsoever. There is simply no need for it. There is, however, something else. As long as France remains a nuclear power it plays the role of a nuclear power. In Europe there are only two such powers—not counting the Soviet Union—France and Great Britain.

When the Soviet and American intermediate- and short-range missile are taken out, the role of French weapons automatically increases. Now some of the French positions on questions concerning disarmament can be explained not so much in terms of ill will but in terms of certain political calculations that stem from their own ideas.

Finally, of course there really are extreme right-wing forces in France which would like to completely frustrate this entire course toward a new detente and toward ending confrontation. Such forces exist, and they are active.

[Zorin] Vadim Valentinovich, in connection with the fact that you have mentioned the role of French nuclear arms, I want to ask Vladimir Fedorovich a question which appears in the letters of quite a few of our television viewers. These letters ask about British and French nuclear arms. Here is one of these letters. It is from engineer Rybakov from Novosibirsk: One can understand, he writes, the reasons the Soviet Union agreed for a time to set aside the question of British and French nuclear arms. But what will our position be after an agreement with the United States on a 50-percent reduction of nuclear weapons is reached? Will we continue to disregard the Anglo-French nuclear potential?

[Petrovskiy] This letter from Novosibirsk quite fairly, I think, says that the question of French and British nuclear forces was set aside temporarily. Now, when prospects for deep reductions, 50-percent reductions, in

strategic offensive arms are appearing, I think that with the realization of these prospects the question of British and French nuclear forces will become quite acute, as will other questions. For example the question of forward-based systems. This is also a very serious issue that must get acute scrutiny. Finally there is the issue of naval arms.

What is very important today, nevertheless, is that in moving on from the agreements reached in Washington, this movement be implemented consistently and without interruptions. We consider it to be our task to enter the third millennium without nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. This is the principle that will guide us regarding the issue of specific types of weapons.

[Zorin] Thank you. The new situation that has arisen in the international arena after the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Washington which we are talking about today, concerns many regions. We have spoken about Europe. I think it also has a direct relation to Southeast Asia as well. Now there are many problems here. The problems of Southeast Asia are complex. I would like to dwell on one, also on the basis of mail received by Studio 9. Comrade Levchenko, a worker from Khabarovsk, writes in his letter: Over several years the world's press spoke about a triangle—Washington, Beijing, Moscow. How have the changes in Soviet-U.S. relations affected this problem, and in particular, what are the prospects for adoption of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's proposal on a Soviet-Chinese summit? How would you answer Comrade Levchenko?

[Zagladin] Comrade Levchenko has focused on one of the points that really is of great significance. There is no need to exaggerate or understate anything here. It is impossible to understate it, because the significance of Soviet-Chinese relations is a factor obvious to all. They are two great socialist powers and the largest countries in the world; two countries that are permanent members of the UN Security Council and two nuclear powers. In other words, there are many criteria which make it obvious and allow one to judge on the significance and importance of Soviet-Chinese relations.

Normal and good relations here are simply essential. In connection with this I would like to recall, that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, in his book "Perestroika and New Thinking" said the following about the past: There were also serious disruptions in the relations between socialist countries. Particularly grave were the breaks in friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, the PRC, and Albania. In general, there were sufficient bitter lessons. Communists derived lessons and we continue to learn today.

We have learned the lessons of history, without a doubt. We desire and are ready to do everything necessary to develop Soviet-Chinese relations. In the sphere of state relations very considerable progress has already been achieved, very considerable. It is continuing, and I am

convinced that it will continue. In particular a new factor has now appeared in the fact that not only trade, cultural, and other relations are developing. Studies have begun of mutual experience in the construction of socialism and experience in reforms being carried out in China and the Soviet Union.

It is true that our Chinese comrades talk about the fact that there are three well-known obstacles to further developing relations, particularly to reestablishing party relations, and—as Comrade Levchenko asks—for a meeting of leaders. Well, our position is known. We do not consider that questions concerning some other countries should be an obstacle to developing relations between any other two states. But if we take an approach to the matter noting that the Chinese comrades see some problems in this for themselves, then, generally, the development of events is such that these problems are moving towards their solution. Slowly but surely. So they will gradually be removed.

[Zorin] Could you specify these problems?

[Zagladin] Well, the Cambodian problem is in the forefront; the Afghan problem, and then the Soviet troops in Mongolia. Part of our troops have left Mongolia, and so forth. We are ready to establish ties along party lines and consider a summit meeting to be important. We are ready to move forward.

Recently I was also asked another question: Do we want to return in Soviet-Chinese relations to the period that existed in the 1950's? It is true that we really had very close relations at that time. But I would put it this way. We do not want to turn back. We want to go forward to new relations. Maybe they will be even better, even more sincere, frank, and close. But they will nevertheless be new relations taking into consideration the entire path we have traversed and the lessons. Their content can be very rich, taking into consideration the experience of our countries, their enormous intellectual potential, and so forth, and their possibilities in cooperating in the international arena.

[Petrovskiy] There is another aspect I would like to note. I think this is an international aspect. It is unlikely that we can apply such categories as triangles, rectangles, or any other geometric structures to it. The fact is that in an interdependent world it is necessary to think in different categories, categories of the participation of all states in the activities and functioning of the system of international relations. Categories of a balance of interests. Here, I think, the proposals being made by our country—I have in mind in particular, proposals made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his Vladivostok speech—open prospects for joint efforts aimed at turning the Asian and Pacific Ocean region into a mighty factor promoting the formation of a system of universal security.

I think that if the Asian process were to develop it could in time join up into a single entity with the European process of security and form a mighty Euro-Asian direction in the formation of a universal system of security. Here, in this process, all states could play an equal role, including China, India, and the Soviet Union.

[Zorin] Vladimir Fedorovich, there is a question I would like to ask you, not as a deputy minister of foreign affairs, but as a scientist. Washington has shown how many unrealized possibilities exist which have remained unused for scores of years. From your point of view as an author of a number of books on the history of international relations, what are the unrealized possibilities which could be realized in the foreseeable future?

[Petrovskiy] This can be discussed both with respect to bilateral and multilateral relations. However, I would like to dwell upon the topic which has always been of concern to political thinkers when they contemplated the problem of eternal peace. Our Vasilii Fedorovich Malinovskiy, director of the school where Pushkin studied, when he wrote his treatise on eternal peace at the end of the 18th century, wrote about the need to observe the law and establish international organizations. Kant, too, working on his treatise on eternal peace, also wrote of the need for international organizations and of their rights which would unite moral and politics—which by the way, is characteristic. Kant considered Glasnost to be the support of Law, and he said that without glasnost there could be no justice of any kind.

An enormous possibility is now opening up for setting into motion the mechanism of international organizations and institutions.

[Zagladin] In other words, where the law combines with morals, so to speak.

[Petrovskiy] Where the law combines with morals....

[Zagladin, interrupting] And with glasnost.

[Petrovskiy] And glasnost, and where the possibility is ensured for each state, regardless of its size, to make its maximum contribution to this matter. In this regard I must say that, well I took part in the last session of the UN General Assembly, and this was not the first session that I took part in, but I do not recall that our proposal—and on the eve of the session Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev addressed a special article to the United Nations, in which he expressed his ideas regarding guarantees for a secure world—rather I do not remember a single session at which our proposals were subjected to several hearings as at this session. Not one of the seven General Assembly committees failed to discuss them.

What was characteristic was the fact that the idea proposed by the Soviet Union and other socialist states, the idea of establishing a universal system of security, was approved by an overwhelming majority at this session.

Now the practical realization of this idea has already started. We see Washington as one of the examples of this realization, and the events that are taking place in Europe also attest to these processes in part. This is precisely the implementation of those unimplemented possibilities that are concealed in the sphere of international politics, and to which international organizations can contribute.

[Zorin] Insofar as our time is about to end, I would like to put you, Vadim Valentinovich, into a difficult situation.

[Zagladin] Thank you.

[Zorin] I would like to ask you, as a scientist and a public and political figure, an unusual question. I would like to try to ask you to fantasize. Let us imagine that we, the three of us, in this composition here in Studio 9, attempted 2 years ago to imagine how the world would look at the beginning of 1988. I am afraid we would not have guessed right, we would be far from what we now see in reality. This is why I would like to ask you to try to imagine what the world and politics will be like in 2-3 years.

[Zagladin] That really is a question! I would say it is say a provocative question! But if we speak seriously, it is very difficult now to make forecasts, especially long-term ones. The world is changing quickly, situation changes quickly everywhere. On the other hand, maybe because of these changes, because there is a certain trend to these changes, and a certain line already exists, it may be easier to make forecasts today than it was 2 years ago. The situation in the world 2 years ago was worse than it is now. But the 15 January 1986 statement, the Congress decisions, and a program did appear, and this made orientation somewhat easier.

Now, however, we have a different situation. The atmosphere now has improved. The first concrete actions have already begun. But on the other hand, due to these facts, we are making the present forecasts in a different atmosphere, and one can foresee an optimistic turn of events. Of course, there may be all kinds of changes, because we are confident as far as as we are concerned, that our restructuring will continue, that the 19th party conference will be held, and that it will make a large contribution to this process, and so forth. We firmly know that presidential elections will be held in the United States, although no one knows who he will be and what will follow. Further, if we take other countries and

continents, any number of unexpected things may occur. I think, however, the general trend will continue, although it is difficult to say specifically what the results will be.

One would like to think that in 2-years we will have the IRM-SRM treaty in force, as well as an agreement on a 50-percent reduction, and an agreement on ABM. But I repeat, that here...[changes thought]. However, what can be said definitely, quite definitely, is what must be done to make events develop in an upward or correct direction. Because the world has not yet reached the parting of the roads, it is still marking time somewhere near this fork in the road. One leads to continuing confrontation, the other to a new detente and the end of confrontation.

So not much is needed to direct the world in the right direction, toward new peaceful relations, humanization, and democratization of international relations. However, much still remains to be done in these directions. First of all it is necessary to ensure continuity of the process of arms reduction. Secondly, a political solution to crisis situations and local conflicts should be achieved. They too are sores which cause irritation in the world and affect the situation. Third, confidence must be developed between countries and peoples by means of the broadest development of contacts.

This will mean that the process of introducing a new thinking in the world, in a broad sense, should be developed and applied in practice. Its introduction into the broadest public circles should be continued. In other words, one should learn to live in a new world now, without awaiting for its creation. We and everyone else should learn to live in it today. Our restructuring, of course, and glasnost play an invaluable role in this. This will increase our strength—not necessarily in a physical sense, nor in the sense of accumulating arms—our moral and political strength. It will enhance the level of the example of socialism.

Many important and interesting ideas came from the 27th party congress. One of them is full of very deep meaning. It is the idea that restructuring and the perfection of socialism is both our national task and, at the same time, an international duty. I think that every one of us at our work place should never forget this.

[Zorin] Well, our time on the air is over. It remains for me to thank you colleagues, for taking part in our talk today, and to thank our television viewers. Until our next meeting here in our Studio 9. Thank you.

Gerasimov's 4 Feb Press Conference Summarized
PM081509 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
5 Feb 88 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] A routine briefing on current questions of international politics was held at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center on 4 February.

Addressing Soviet and foreign correspondents, G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, ridiculed the reports by the SVENSKA TELEGRAMBYRA and a number of other foreign news agencies claiming that there had been a nuclear accident in the USSR. There has been no accident on Soviet territory, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman declared. All Soviet AES's have been operating normally. The USSR State Hydrometeorology Committee service, which studies the radiation background, has recorded no increase in this background on Soviet territory.

Allegations are being heard in the United States that the Soviet Union, on the signing of the INF Treaty, understated the official data it exchanged on the number of its missiles, the chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate went on to say. He emphasized that the numerical and other data on Soviet missiles, missile launchers, and associated auxiliary installations and equipment were set forth with exhaustive fullness and accuracy in the memorandum on the accord, which is an inalienable part of the whole treaty and comes into force simultaneously with it. The data cited in it reflect the actual situation in this sphere as of 1 November 1987.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman called the conclusion drawn by Tsutomu Kawara, chief of Japan's National Defense Agency, unexpected, to say the least. Answering a question in parliament on the consequences for the international situation of the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, Kawara claimed that the potential threat to Japan from Soviet troops in the Far East is increasing.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman linked the claims of an increase in the so-called "potential threat" to the discussion in Tokyo of the draft military budget for the new fiscal year, which provides for an increase of more than 5.2% in military spending.

It is also necessary to consider in the context of the debate in the Japanese parliament the REUTERS report that the Soviet Union maintains troops in Vietnam. The USSR has no troops there. There are no Soviet military bases in Vietnam either.

Answers were given to journalists' questions.

'International Commentary' on Kohl in CSSR
PM101055 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Feb 88
Morning Edition p 4

[S. Mushkaterov "International Commentary": "Strengthen the Common European Home"]

[Text] Last week FRG Chancellor H. Kohl paid an official visit to Czechoslovakia, the results of which have been widely commented on abroad.

The history of relations between these two states has been through different stages, and its development could not be depicted as a curve on a graph, for instance, moving steadily upwards. The first visit to Czechoslovakia by an FRG chancellor was only 15 years ago, and the same amount of time has elapsed since the two states signed the Treaty on the Normalization of Relations. Finally, 10 years separate the countries from 1978 when, during an official visit to the FRG by CSSR President G. Husak, the sides signed a joint statement expressing their desire to develop good-neighborly relations on the basis of the All-European Conference Final Act. It is these three events that determine the importance of the new stage in the dialogue between the two countries—a stage where not only can positive results be evaluated and strengthened and but relations can be given a new boost.

During the talks held by H. Kohl in Prague with M. Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, G. Husak, the country's president, and L. Strougal, premier of the CSSR government, the sides discussed the main issues concerning bilateral relations: political, economic, scientific, and cultural. Much attention was given to the exchange of opinions on the development of the general situation in Europe and the world as a whole. In particular, both sides welcomed the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and noted the importance of the Soviet Union and the United States signing an agreement this year on radically reducing strategic offensive weapons. They also spoke in favor of concluding a convention to completely ban and eliminate chemical weapons as soon as possible.

Nevertheless, the fact that H. Kohl still has a negative attitude to the CSSR and GDR proposals to begin talks on forming a zone in central Europe free of nuclear and chemical weapons cannot fail to be a source of concern.

As expected, economic cooperation issues were one of the most important features of bilateral relations discussed by the Czechoslovak and West German leaders at the talks. The FRG is Czechoslovakia's biggest trade partner among the nonsocialist states. Trade between the two countries has doubled in the past 12 years. Nevertheless, the Czechoslovak side believes that there are still considerable reserves in the sphere of economic cooperation. This primarily concerns such progressive forms as, for example, the formation of joint enterprises. Economic restructuring in Czechoslovakia is opening up new possibilities in this direction.

Another very important result of H. Kohl's visit and his talks with the Czechoslovak leaders is the decision to develop relations between the CSSR and FRG parliaments and governments and between social, youth, cultural, and scientific organizations in the interests of mutual knowledge and mutual understanding. This is all the more important in view of the fact that the nature of our "common European home" will depend to a considerable extent on how relations develop between these two neighboring states situated in the center of the continent and belonging to different political and economic systems.

Air Terrorism Condemned at International Meeting
LD092302 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1938 GMT 9 Feb 88

[Text] Ottawa, 9 February (TASS)—The international conference on air law opened today in Montreal at the headquarters of the International Civil Aviation Organization [ICAO]. Delegations from 80 UN members, including the USSR, the Ukraine, and Belorussia, are taking part in the work of the conference. The main issue on the agenda is the adoption of an international document on the fight against terrorist acts at airports.

The Soviet Union unconditionally condemns international terrorism in all its forms, no matter where or by whom terrorist acts are committed, Mikhail Timofeyev, head of the Soviet delegation and deputy minister of civil aviation, stressed in his speech. Terrorism is an evil that creates new centers of tension and destabilizes the international situation. Our country attaches great significance to strengthening the cooperation of all states in working out effective measures to prevent this evil. We regard this kind of cooperation as one of the fundamental bases for the setting up of a comprehensive system of international security.

The position of the Soviet Union has met with broad understanding and support from the delegations of many countries. The decision of the Soviet Union to join the Tokyo Convention on crimes and other acts committed on board airplanes was positively received by participants in the conference. In this connection, it is stressed that the fight against international terrorism in air transport will be truly effective only with the all-around cooperation of all states in the world.

Shakhnazarov's 'World Government' Idea Criticized
PM091601 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Feb 88
Second Edition p 2

[Article by A. Bovin: "World Community and World Government. Reaction to the Article 'The World Community Is Amenable to Government'"]

[Text] The need for purposeful global government of the world community is becoming increasingly apparent. G. Shakhnazarov, corresponding member of the USSR

Academy of Sciences, is right to draw this to our attention. But the main thesis of his article (PRAVDA 15 January), basically, as far as I understand, that it is time to return to the idea of a "centralized international authority," a "world government," raises doubts.

Let us look at G. Shakhnazarov's train of thought and line of argument. He recalls that in the fifties, Soviet foreign policy theory and practice were entirely opposed to "mondialism." In the first place, its supporters categorically rejected sovereignty. In the second place, in conditions where the United States had a considerable economic, political, and military advantage in the worldwide correlation of forces, the idea of a world government was bound to result in a legalized form of world domination by U.S. imperialism.

Now the position of the United States has changed fundamentally. So "one of the main arguments against a world government has gone by the board." But what about the other main argument, the other obstacle? This obstacle can be removed if a world government is based not on a denial of sovereignty but on a "balance of interests" of different states, taking these interests into account and coordinating them.

Let us stop there for a moment.

If one goes by common sense and accepted usage, government presupposes that the governing systems have the right to issue "commands" that are compulsory for those whom they govern. Therefore, government is impossible without limitation (or self-limitation) of the "sovereignty" of the governed. G. Shakhnazarov appears to acknowledge this. At any rate, he writes about the "objective contradiction between sovereignty and world government." But, in my view, he considerably oversimplifies the situation when he carries the discussion into the area of balance of interests.

In this area equal partners build their relations on a mobile basis of mutual compromises that changes with time. One could only talk about the presence of a governing center, an "international authority" in a case where the steady, constant balance of interests enabled the members of the world community to delegate some of their rights (their sovereignty) to that center, that is, consider its decisions (within limits defined by the balance of interests) binding on themselves and compulsory. As for the current and foreseeable (at least in the medium term) level of balance of interests, it is scarcely so steady as to be able to take the weight of a world government.

But let us follow the writer further. He points out quite rightly that "to govern you need law and a government." Let us leave aside the issue of law as a secondary issue in this context. But what about government? "There is no government as yet," we read, "but one can definitely say that the rudiments exist...." The "rudiments" are the numerous international organizations headed by the

United Nations. Assessing the "degree of governability of the world" with the aid of the aforementioned "rudiments," the writer of the article claims that government is farthest advanced in the sphere of international division of labor and also in the sphere of "maintaining public order through joint efforts." As regards the government of global problems, the situation is "much worse" and "worst of all" in the case of the government of issues of war and peace.

Let us analyze this.

Can the United Nations and, in particular, other international organizations be regarded as the "rudiments" of a world government? In purely abstract terms, or, at the other extreme, in the sphere of international journalism, they probably can. But in the scientific plane? Not a single state would carry out (nor does it) a decision by the United Nations or an international organization if it considered it contradictory to its interests. The activity of the United Nations, the experience accumulated by numerous international organizations of cooperation and coordination of interests, and the potential for trust that is increasing as a consequence—all this in principle can be seen as the gradual establishment of conditions in which the creation of the "rudiments" of a world government is conceivable (only conceivable!).

What and whose "joint efforts" to maintain "public order" is he talking about? I cannot guess. Although, I suppose, there are UN troops in a number of regions of the world maintaining order there. The claim about "far advanced" government of "international division of labor" is also dubious. What does he have in mind? CEMA? The Common Market? The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade? Like several other organizations, they influence—in varying degrees—international division of labor. But on the whole, at the global and regional levels, it continues to be at the mercy of elemental, ungovernable forces, primarily those of the market and competition.

Thus, to my mind, the idea of a world government, even "rudimentary," today and, apparently, in the near future as well, lacks a sufficiently sound basis. And the article essentially admits this. The last sentence says: In the future a "world orchestra" performing "without a conductor a melody of peace and cooperation" will become more and more clearly discernible. Precisely, without a conductor.

An observation of a more general nature: When elevating general human interests, one should not forget, it seems to me, that **class** [word published in boldface] interests continue to exist alongside general human interests and that an integral world is inseparable from a world torn by contradictions. If we forget about this, we will find ourselves in a sociopolitical vacuum in which the contradiction between socialism and capitalism disappears,

in which peaceful coexistence is dissociated from the class conflict, and in which, as we have just seen, the "rudiments" of a world government already exist.

I know how nice it is to soar in the pure air of abstraction. But I prefer to remain in closer contact with reality, both social and political.

Church Millennium Conference Opens in Leningrad
PM091101 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Feb 88
Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Dialogue Between Theologians and Scholars"]

[Text] Well-known Soviet scholars in the spheres of linguistics, the fine arts, and architecture are participating in the Third International Theological Conference which has opened in Leningrad. It is being held by the Russian Orthodox Church and is devoted to the millennium of the introduction of Christianity into Russia.

"The Christianization of Russia was a major event in European history and world culture, made a profound mark on the development of human civilization, and helped spread education and literacy," Metropolitan Aleksey of Leningrad and Novgorod told a TASS correspondent during an interview. "Last November, at our country's suggestion, the UNESCO General Conference adopted a special resolution 'On the Celebration of the Millennium of the Introduction of Christianity into Russia.' At the present meeting, we will endeavor to provide our guests with exhaustive, objective information about the life and activity of the Russian Orthodox Church in the new social conditions and about the transformations taking place in the Soviet Union, which are understood and supported by believers."

More on Venice Human Rights Symposium
LD052354 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1848 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Excerpts] Venice, 5 Feb (TASS)—"The 3d day of the symposium 'Human Rights and Freedom of Religious Belief in Europe for Peace in the Helsinki Spirit,' which is taking place on the island of San Giorgio Maggiore in the Venetian lagoon, was dedicated to discussing issues connected with the position of the church and religion in contemporary society, and also to the problems of national, ethnic, and religious minorities, in various countries," [passage omitted]

"The speeches by representatives of the Soviet delegation—Vladimir, the archbishop of Pskov and Porkhov, and Ludvig Kamilevskiy, a Roman Catholic priest from the Catholic Church in Lvov, were received with great interest and attention. They looked in detail at the processes of restructuring and further democratization

of public life in the Soviet Union, and their influence on the position of the Orthodox, Catholic and other churches in our country. They symposium will continue its work tomorrow."

Delegate Interviewed on UN Human Rights Panel
PM101707 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Feb 88
Second Edition p 4

[B. Dubrovin interview in Geneva with V.B. Lomeyko, head of USSR delegation at the 44th session of the UN Commission on Human Rights: "Discussions About Human Rights Must Be Held on an Honest Basis"; first paragraph is editorial introduction; date not specified]

[Text] Geneva, Feb—At the moment, the 44th session of the UN Commission on Human Rights is taking place in Geneva. Our correspondent B. Dubrovin met with the head of the USSR delegation V.B. Lomeyko and asked him to answer a few questions.

[Dubrovin] Representatives of the 43 member states of the UN Commission on Human Rights have assembled in Geneva. What is the present session's task, and what questions does it intend to discuss?

[Lomeyko] The UN Commission on Human Rights is one of the main UN organs, where the most extensive range of questions touching on this group of problems is examined. Apart from the 43 member states, which include 4 socialist states—the USSR, the GDR, Bulgaria, and Belorussia—72 observer countries and more than 100 international nongovernmental organizations without the right to a deciding voice are taking part in the work of the commission.

The present session, which will last until 11 March, will discuss such questions as human rights violations on the Israeli-occupied Arab territories, in South Africa, Chile, and other regions, questions about peoples' right to self-determination, suppressing the crimes of apartheid, mercenaries, the problems of fulfilling international human rights pacts, the elimination of all forms of intolerance and discrimination, and many others.

[Dubrovin] What is the atmosphere like at the session? What is new and interesting in various countries' approach to the questions under discussion?

[Lomeykov] The session has practically only just begun: Only the 1st week of its work has elapsed. I would point out too, in my opinion, important elements. The first is the, undoubtedly, more favorable atmosphere at the present session than in previous years. Of course, countries' fundamental positions have not changed, for they reflect the contradictory political and ideological realities of various systems and various philosophical and religious viewpoints. But the trend toward cooperation and increased attention to other people's views and a greater desire to seek out mutually acceptable solutions have become more marked. General positive changes in

the international situation are making themselves felt in this extremely sensitive sphere of international relations. Many delegates see a direct link here with the beneficial processes which are gathering pace as a result of the Soviet-U.S. accords secured at the December summit in Washington.

I cannot fail to point out a second element—the sometimes overt, sometimes covert resistance of those forces that do not want to strengthen the spirit of cooperation. Circles for whom confrontation is like intoxicating ozone are extremely influential in the world. They exploit the human rights question in order to whip up intolerance and hostility.

[Dubrovin] Have these elements already emerged at the commission session?

[Lomeykov] Quite definitely. The question of human rights violations on the occupied Arab territories is first on the list of priority questions at the session. The preliminary agenda was established 1 year ago. Literally on the eve of the session's opening the Palestinians' demonstrations on the occupied territories once again confirmed to the whole world how massively and flagrantly human rights are being violated on the Israeli-occupied Arab territories.

Speeches by delegates at the session, including those who until recently found it possible if not to justify, then to "understand" the occupiers' actions, showed that flagrant violence provokes protests. No one at the session could find words to justify what is happening on the occupied Arab lands. The discussion of this question showed that events there touch every man on earth, irrespective of his sympathies and antipathies because we live in an integrated interdependent world.

The explosive situation in the Near East reveals especially acutely the interdependence of all factors of international security: military, political, economic, and humanitarian factors, including above all human rights.

That is why—and this is also a sign of the present times—many more countries than before have not only condemned the violence carried out by Israel but have also advocated the speediest convocation of an international conference on the Near East. This meeting would be in support of USSR proposals sent at the end of January this year to the UN secretary general to accelerate the process of a Near East settlement.

In this situation, attempts by certain circles at the session itself and outside it to distract public attention away from the scandalous human rights violations on the occupied Arab territories, in the south of Africa, and in Chile by means of farfetched attacks on socialist countries puzzle many delegates. These circles organize press conferences, issue bulletins, and prepare radio broadcasts aiming to create a deliberately distorted picture of life in the socialist countries.

[Dubrovin] How do delegates regard this situation?

[Lomeyko] Most of them are not enthusiastic about this confrontational approach. But, of course, the notorious "solidarity among allies," especially within the NATO framework, also has its impact. However, even in these countries the desire to seek forms of constructive cooperation is growing. As for the nonaligned countries, they, more than anyone, are interested in pooling the efforts of world cooperation in order to give human rights real substance. They see that the leaders of the attacks on the socialist countries and, sometimes, on developing countries are those who cannot ensure vital human rights for thousands and thousands of their citizens who are without work and often without a roof over their head, and who are suffering from racial and political discrimination.

The world is tired of the activity of those who advocate dual morality. People want to pool their efforts, energy, and creative and material potential to eliminate hunger, poverty, and disease and to provide living conditions worthy of man and a worthy environment, rather than create new instruments of war and new myths of hostility.

The commission session is in its initial stages. Not everyone has shown their hand or lifted their guard yet. It is not excluded that some people will try both to

sharpen the debate and kindle the flame of confrontation. But the human rights question is a two-way street. We have something to be proud of, for we have achieved a great deal in this sphere in the years of Soviet power. The process of broad democratization now underway in our country testifies to the fact that we want to consolidate our gains and improve our democracy. We have something to say to the unsolicited moralists whom it is appropriate to remind of the words of Bernard Shaw: "Those who can, do. Those who can't, teach."

The Soviet delegation has clear constructive positions. We are not against critical debate. But we want debate on an honest basis, imbued with a sense of responsibility and interest in the genuine defense of human rights for the sake of man himself, and for the sake of people's happiness.

UNESCO Cultural Assets Convention Ratified
PM091549 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Feb 88
Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Convention Ratified"]

[Text] A Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree of 2 February 1988 ratifies the convention on measures designed to prohibit and prevent the unlawful import, export, and transfer of right of ownership of cultural assets approved by UNESCO on 14 November 1970.

United States & Canada

U.S. Reacts to Gorbachev Afghanistan Speech

LD101102 Moscow TASS in English 1015 GMT
10 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 10 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko:

The statement on Afghanistan by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, continues to attract attention in the U.S. capital.

The full text or excerpts of his statement have been published in major newspapers and are widely commented on television.

According to Marlin Fitzwater, assistant to the President for press relations, and Charles Redman, State Department spokesman, the Soviet leader's statement was thoroughly studied in Washington at the highest level.

The White House assessed the statement as "a very good step in the right direction," Fitzwater said.

"The question, of course, and the question that the general secretary raised as well, is the progress that will be made in Geneva in the U.N.-sponsored talks between Pakistan and the Kabul government."

Redman said that the United States welcomed Gorbachev's statement and the USSR's readiness to set a specific date for the beginning of the pull-out of its troops from Afghanistan as "a positive signal of serious Soviet intent to withdraw from Afghanistan."

The Soviet leader's statement riveted U.S. Congress attention, too. During Tuesday's hearings at the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Representative Lee Hamilton (Dem.) suspended the session and requested the attending assistant secretary of state, Rozanne Ridgway, to explain the U.S. stance in the light of the Soviet statement.

Hamilton asked to clarify the issue of when and under what circumstances would the U.S. stop military aid to the Afghan rebels.

Ridgway stressed the importance of Gorbachev's announcement. She said that the United States welcomed it, noting that the Soviet Union showed "apparent willingness to address a very key question, which has been the establishment of an acceptable timetable for Soviet troop withdrawal."

As to the question of terminating American military assistance to the Afghan rebels, the assistant secretary said that the cut-off of aid would take place sometime "in between" the start of the Soviet troop withdrawal and its completion.

"In the context of the work that was being done under the leadership of Mr. Cordovez and the preparation of Geneva agreements, that all of the issues, including the question of when does aid come to an end, those blanks have been filled in.

The blank that remains to be filled in is a troop withdrawal date. If that were achieved, then all of the other things that have been talked about fall into place."

What puts one on one's guard is that officials in the U.S. Administration which provided and is still providing the Afghan rebels with hundreds of millions of dollars and up-to-date weapons, refer time and again to the complexity and changeability of the situation and developments in Afghanistan and around it.

It is even more disquieting that the United States does not say anything as to whether it would be prepared to facilitate the process of national reconciliation unfolding at the Afghan Government's initiative.

The discussion of the Soviet statement on Afghanistan in Washington "coincided" with a "symposium" organized by the so-called Committee for Free Afghanistan attended by several Afghan counter-revolutionary leaders.

The participants in the "symposium" openly declared on Tuesday that they would spare no effort to foil the process of national reconciliation in Afghanistan.

Seen as 'Main News' of Day

PM101325 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Feb 88
Second Edition p 4

[Reports by own correspondents V. Okulov, V. Gan, O. Kitsenko, and A. Lyutov and TASS for 9 February under general heading "Sweeping Approval: The World Public Welcomes the Determination of the Soviet and Afghan Leadership To Achieve a Political Settlement in Afghanistan"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Washington—The statement on Afghanistan issued by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was treated as the main news of the day in Washington political circles. The concrete manifestation of Soviet political will, the striving to create real preconditions for the elimination of the Afghan conflict have evoked a reaction here that is, on the whole, positive. Even the U.S. Administration, which has done much to kindle the war in Afghanistan, was forced to admit—clearly without great enthusiasm—the constructive nature of the Soviet proposals.

In response to a request to give his opinion of the Soviet leader's statement, President Reagan replied: "I am waiting for a clarification of the conditions." Later, M. Fitzwater, the White House spokesman, explaining the

President's words, said that M.S. Gorbachev's statement "looks like a positive step and we hope that it turns out to be one. However, we must wait and examine the conditions."

C. Redman, the State Department spokesman, also declined to express a definitive opinion, saying: "The setting of an acceptable timetable for the withdrawal of Soviet forces was a key precondition for progress in the Geneva process, and we welcome M. Gorbachev's obvious readiness to resolve this question."

The ABC television network described the Soviet leader's statement as "the clearest indication that the Soviets really want to withdraw their forces from Afghanistan." [passage omitted]

Murphy's Middle East Tour Sparks Comment

U.S.-Israeli Efforts 'Futile'

PM101041 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Feb 88
First Edition pp 1, 5

[Own correspondent Yuriy Glukhov dispatch "Futile Efforts"]

[Text] Beirut, 3 Feb—There are signs of another flurry of U.S. diplomatic activity in the Near East. Washington's emissary P. Habib has only just been here. Now the arrival of R. Murphy, U.S. assistant secretary of state, is expected.

U.S. Embassy staff and diplomats in Arab countries have been having a busy time. Reports of a "new U.S. Near East initiative" have appeared. This is being loudly advertized in Tel Aviv, although it is difficult to grasp what this initiative consists of, and indeed whether it exists at all. The futile U.S.-Israeli efforts are very reminiscent of Andersen's fairy tale "The Emperor's New Clothes."

The skillfully stage-managed information "leak" about the U.S. "initiatives" is, to all appearances, designed to create the impression that the United States is concerned about the situation in the region. It is called upon to stifle the stridently negative reaction in Arab countries to Washington's obstructionist stance at the UN Security Council during the discussion of the situation on the Arab territories occupied by Israel and the continuing U.S. connivance at the unbridled rampaging of the Israeli military—and no more.

The reports about the U.S. "initiative" for solving the Palestinian problem feature terms like "self-government" and "autonomy," but there is no mention of the recognition or restoration of the Palestinian people's legitimate rights, above all their right to establish their own independent state.

Washington's Near East diplomatic efforts smack very much of the old Camp David separate deals taken out of the mothballs. Incidentally, Tel Aviv has never given up striving for their full implementation. As Israeli Prime Minister Y. Shamir put it, the formula for Palestinian autonomy contained in the Camp David agreements is ideal. He continues to categorically reject the idea of the convocation of an international conference on a Near East settlement.

It must be noted that it is not just the U.S. Near East policy whose revival is currently being attempted but also its champions that are odious. For instance, in 1982 P. Habib prepared the evacuation from West Beirut of the Palestinian organizations' headquarters and the Palestinian fighters, thus paving the way for the treacherous entry of the Israeli forces and the subsequent massacres at Sabra and Chatila.

It is no accident that the U.S. diplomatic offensive has met with a negative reaction in Arab countries. The U.S. initiative is unacceptable, M. Dudin, Jordanian minister for occupied territories, has declared, because it does not accord with Palestinian aspirations and Arab accords on an international conference. In the words of the official Syrian spokesman, it is an attempt to divert attention from the Palestinian revolt.

Palestinian organizations have responded critically to Washington's maneuvers. It is obvious that the United States has hastened to the assistance of Tel Aviv, which has been caught unawares by the Palestinian demonstrations in the occupied territories. However, these are futile efforts. The revolt on occupied territories shows the potential force of the Palestinians' struggle for the implementation of their national aspirations. The policy of diversionary maneuvers and behind-the-scenes arm-twisting is not working out. There is only one way to achieve a settlement: the convocation of an international conference and the elaboration of a just settlement of Near East problems, and primarily the Palestinian problem.

Peace Plan 'Doomed' To Fail

LD091523 Moscow TASS in English 1011 GMT
9 Feb 88

[Text] Cairo February 9 TASS—U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and Asian Affairs Richard Murphy has arrived in Cairo today. He is currently on a tour of the region, which has already taken him to Syria and Saudi Arabia. After Egypt he is to visit Jordan and Israel. According to the Middle-East news agency MENA, the U.S. emissary is to hold talks here with Egyptian President Husni Mubarak and foreign minister of the country Ahmad 'Ismail 'Abd al-Majid.

Commenting on Murphy's tour, local observers draw attention to Washington's resumed attempts at forcing on the Arab states its formula of separate Middle-East deal. The latest "initiative" of the U.S. Administration

designed to substitute for the idea of an international conference for a search of a comprehensive Middle-East settlement and disregarding the national interests of the Palestinian people has already been rejected by the Palestine Liberation Organization and a number of Arab countries. It has been approved only by Israel. The intention of the White House to force its formula meeting only the hegemonistic ambitions of the USA and Israel is doomed to a failure, most of the observers say.

U.S. 'Cool' to Mubarak's Mideast Peace Proposals

PM081131 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Feb 88
Second Edition p 1

[Own correspondent Vladimir Belyakov's "Correspondent's Comment": "Marking Time"]

[Text] Cairo, 7 Feb—President H. Mubarak of Egypt is back from his second lengthy tour abroad this year. In early January, he visited eight Arab states in the Near East. This time the president's travels took him mainly to Western countries: the FRG, Britain, the United States, France, Italy, Greece, Turkey, and Morocco.

In an interview with THE WASHINGTON POST on the eve of his tour, the president of the Arab Republic of Egypt put forward a series of proposals on a Near East settlement. Their essence boils down to easing the situation in the Israeli-occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip, where the Palestinians' uprising is continuing, over a 6-month period and simultaneously embarking on preparations to convene an international peace conference. The proposals envisage cessation of all acts of violence in the occupied lands and a freeze on the building of Israeli settlements there.

Even though some elements of the proposals are not specific enough, their general orientation is obvious—toward an all-embracing peace settlement on a collective basis. Moreover, Egypt has let it be understood that the proposals are coordinated with Arab state leaders.

This is what the Egyptian president took along on his latest foreign travels. The proposals were supported in West European capitals, but Washington was cool toward them. President R. Reagan expressed approval of only one element—the moratorium on all acts of violence in all occupied lands. G. Shultz stated in turn that direct talks between the Arabs and Israel still remain the U.S. objective. No sooner had the high-ranking Egyptian visitor left U.S. soil than the U.S. representative blocked the adoption of a new Security Council resolution calling on Israel to respect the religious and civil rights of Palestinians in the occupied territories. At the same time, the Israeli mass media reported that Washington has proposed reviving the old idea of "Palestinian autonomy" in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip subject to a cosmetic amendment: replacing the term "autonomy,"

compromised by the Camp David deal, by the term "self-government." Washington has dispatched Assistant Secretary of State R. Murphy to the Near East to explain its "new ideas."

One gets the impression that the United States is trying to take the initiative with a view to replacing a genuine movement toward a Near East settlement by the semblance of such a movement, by a process of marking time. The Syrian newspaper AL-BA'TH notes that the U.S. proposal is based on an idea which was rejected by the Arabs a long time ago. But Washington probably only wants to play for time. As far as the U.S. Arab allies are concerned, the Egyptian president's tour proved once more that they have no levers with which to influence the U.S. Administration's stance.

Reagan Talks With Saudi Foreign Minister

LD100923 Moscow TASS in English 0728 GMT
10 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 10 TASS—TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports:

President Reagan had a meeting at the White House on Tuesday with Saudi Arabia's foreign minister Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal. He arrived in Washington as a special representative of the Cooperation Council for the Arab states of the Gulf and King Fahd of Saudi Arabia.

According to an official spokesman for the White House, the Saudi foreign minister handed over to the U.S. President two messages from King Fahd. According to American officials, one of them is on the problem of putting an end to the Iran-Iraq war. Prince Sa'ud underlined the importance of stepping up international efforts to have the bloodshed ended as soon as possible. President Reagan, according to his personal representative, noted the United States' interest in seeing the conflict resolved but he meanwhile reaffirmed Washington's intention to preserve the American military presence in the Persian Gulf area.

The second message handed over to the President deals with the Palestinian problem and the situation on the Israeli-occupied Arab lands. The official spokesman for the White House has said that the document calls upon the U.S. leadership to take more vigorous steps to promote the process of a peace settlement in the Middle East. But many local news analysts express serious doubt that one can expect from Washington any new initiatives with a view of bringing this process out of the impasse. As to the idea of convocation of an international peace conference on the Middle East, the Reagan administration continues advancing all sorts of strings and reservations. Washington insists as before on such an "acceptable format" of the conference that could lead to the beginning of direct negotiations between Arab countries and Israel.

Moscow Comments on Reagan's Plan To Aid Contras
LD091752 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1130 GMT 9 Feb 88

[Text] As has been announced in Washington, U.S. President Reagan will meet with Republican leaders in Congress to discuss possible ways of rendering additional aid to the Nicaraguan counterrevolution. That report is commented upon by Lidiya Podolnaya:

[Podolnaya] It is easy to notice that the President has had some new worries added to the old ones over the past few days. He is holding one conference after another at the White House, and all with one purpose: to find a way to continue supporting the Somozite gangs.

As you know, the House of Representatives rejected the request to allocate \$36.2 million, whereas the Senate supported it. That is why the debate has now shifted to the Congress Conference Committee. But time will not wait: On 29 February, the terms of contra aid stipulated by the law expires. Reagan has publicly reassured them that he will not leave them without funds, and it looks likely that he is going to keep his promise. In any case, judging from reports in the press, various options are being developed in the White House to provide for the emergency which would arise if Congress denies the request for the required sum. For instance, it is being planned to side-step Congress through third countries or private organizations. Some reports to that effect have been hastily denied by official Washington, but I believe not many people have been convinced by that.

For that was precisely the tactics used by the chief hero of the scandalous "Iran-contra" story, Lieutenant Colonel Oliver North, in 1986 when Congress prohibited the financing of the Nicaraguan counterrevolution. So there are precedents. The gist of all the options now being discussed in the press is not to allow the flow of dollars to the Somozites to dry up. The President is also likely to agree to the proposal by a group of legislators to go ahead with allocating the money, but only within the limits of humanitarian aid. It includes deliveries of medicines, foodstuffs, and clothing while completely forbidding supplies of weapons, ammunition, and spares for military equipment.

But humanitarian aid, as stated in the Guatemala agreement, is only allowed if the Somozites stop the armed struggle and if their groups lay down their weapons; they are unwilling to go for that.

So, what option will be chose by the administration, after all? Perhaps an answer to this question will be provided by the forthcoming meeting of the President with the Republican leaders in Congress. However, one should remember that the means are always dictated by the end, and with the present U.S. Administration the end

remains unchanged: overthrowing the Sandinist government. That is precisely what is going to set the climate for the search for ways of rendering supplementary aid to the Nicaraguan counterrevolution.

'Experts' Dispute Official View of KAL Incident
LD091737 Moscow TASS in English 1647 GMT
9 Feb 88

[Text] New York February 9 TASS—TASS correspondent Andrey Chytov reports:

A paper plane launched by Uncle Sam goes down in a spin—is a picture with which today's NEW YORK TIMES illustrated a column of letters disputing the official version of the incident with the South Korean KAL-007 airliner and calling for a repeated objective investigation. The provocation involving the KAL-007 had been staged in the Soviet Far East by U.S. secret services on the night of August 31 to September 1, 1983.

The authors of the letters are experts who for a long time studied all the circumstances of the tragedy. Their letters to the newspaper were prompted by the publication of new data on the incident received from U.S. intelligence bodies by Congressman Lee Hamilton who in 1983 had been the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The data have it that the administration deliberately misled its own people and the whole world.

Fletcher Prauty, former director of special operations of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, writes that already on September 1, 1983, THE NEW YORK TIMES front-paged a report on the disappearance of the plane with 269 people on board.

Where did the newspaper get information on the evening of August 31? An answer to the question was given some time later by the staff of the South Korean Ministry of Foreign Affairs. They said they had been given a U.S. CIA report distorting the picture of the incident. Subsequently it was precisely the verbatim wording from the document that got into newspapers the world over.

Prauty writes that the CIA's strange key report gave rise to a respective reaction of seven countries, including the USA, and put them in an embarrassing position. Facts call for a more satisfactory explanation.

David Pearson, a prominent publicist, professor at Yale University, and John Keppel, former staff member of the Department of State and the CIA, write in their letter that the main purpose of a new investigation should be to find out why the South Korean airliner found itself over Soviet territory and what role in sending it there had been played by the U.S. Government. They point out that during their own investigation they received evidence that the KAL-007 crew knew about the deviation from the course. U.S. air traffic controllers and military specialists likewise knew about that several hours before

the plane was shot down and did nothing to bring the plane back to the true course. Finally important evidence including recordings of talks between air traffic controllers and tapes with radar readings were changed or destroyed by U.S. officials. One should add to that numerous attempts by the authorities to discredit critics and in every way to interfere with the investigation of the incident, as well as a long list of official statements, almost all of which without exception were notable for lop-sidedness and ambiguity and at times overt falsity.

Urging the Congress to demand and attentively to study all the remaining documents regarding the 'KAL-007 case', David Pearson and John Keppel emphasize that it is essential to establish the truth, whatever it is, to prevent a recurrence of new such tragedies.

China

Joint Border Photography Planned

LD100918 Moscow TASS in English 0847 GMT
10 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 10 TASS—Soviet and Chinese experts have considered and coordinated issues of conducting joint aerial photography of the eastern part of the common border.

The experts met in Moscow on February 1-10 within the framework of the Soviet-Chinese talks on border issues.

Alekseyev Reviews Improvement in Ties

OW090555 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 1500 GMT 8 Feb 88

[Station Observer Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners, the Soviet people attach great importance to a further boost in the goodneighborly relations between the Soviet Union and China. Our stance on this question has been explained clearly in the resolutions adopted by the CPSU congresses and the CPSU Central Committee plenums, as well as in speeches by General Secretary Gorbachev. Comrade Gorbachev said: I believe that time will show that neither side will benefit from estrangement and alienation, especially from unfriendliness and suspicion. On our part, we intend to actively strive to eliminate the negative aspects in Soviet-Chinese relations which have caused artificial (?hostility) between the two countries. I am convinced that this will ultimately be achieved. On this, our station observer Alekseyev writes:

In recent years, Soviet-Chinese relations have improved to a certain extent, and have continued to grow. This cannot but please the Soviet people. For example, in the past 5 years, bilateral trade has increased 10 times, and it will rise considerably this year, according to the stipulations in the barter trade agreement signed last 28 December. It is also worth noting the following good signs in our bilateral economic cooperation: the Soviet Union is

helping China build and renovate 24 large industrial plants; it will participate in the construction in China of 3 power stations with a total capacity of 3.6 million kw; it will also help China modernize some large industrial enterprises which were built with Soviet aid in the fifties.

It is also gratifying that our two countries have taken identical or similar stands on a series of major international issues. For example, we highly value the favorable response from China with regard to the Soviet-U.S. summit held last December, and especially the Chinese welcome to the signing of the INF Treaty. The Soviet people are convinced that the development of Soviet-Chinese cooperation in all fields is not only in line with the objective needs of our two countries, but also is identical with the common vital interests of the Soviet and the Chinese people and socialist ideals.

As pointed out recently by Zagladin, first deputy chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, on the popular Soviet television program Studio 9: As far as Soviet-Chinese relations are concerned, we not only want to return to the fifties, a period marked by close ties, but also go forward for better and more sincere new relations, taking into consideration the entire path we have traversed and the lessons learned.

Problems remain to be resolved in Soviet-Chinese relations, which naturally call for stepping up political dialogue between our two countries. The Soviet people believe that the prerequisites for a Soviet-Chinese summit are ripe. Needless to say, the summit will not only boost the relations between our two countries but also help normalize the situation in the Asian-Pacific region and the world as a whole.

Komsomol Official on Youth Cooperation

OW031101 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 0600 GMT 30 Jan 88

[Report on interview with (Cherishev), International Department of the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee staff member]

[Excerpts] Dear young people of China: We wish to talk about the prospects of cooperation between Soviet and Chinese young people. First, we would like to describe how relations between Soviet and Chinese young people developed last year. Young people's tourist groups were formed with the help of the friendship associations. There is no doubt, however, the official restoration of relations between the Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR and the All-China Youth Federation was a major event, followed by the visit of personnel of the Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR to China for the first time in 29 years.

(Cherishev), a staff member of the International Department of the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee, told our station reporter about this visit. He said: As a result of this visit, we have concluded an agreement for

cooperation between the youth organizations of the two countries in 1988. Right now, we are actively making preparations for Chinese young people to make a return visit to the Soviet Union, including a visit by an All-China Youth Federation delegation led by the federation's president. In addition, another agreement was signed for sending a delegation of the Student Council of the USSR to China. During this delegation's visit to China, it is expected to officially restore relations between the council and the All-China Students Federation. We will continue to promote tourism, which has become a traditional form of our cooperation. In April this year, some 260 young Soviet tourists will visit Shanghai. They represent Soviet young people of all walks of life. [passage omitted]

In conclusion, (Cherishev) said: We believe the contacts, and mutual understanding of each other's life and interests, between the Soviet and Chinese young people will contribute to the promotion of closer cooperation and relations between the two countries.

Northeast Asia

USSR Protests Japanese Demonstrations

LD091854 Moscow TASS in English 1838 GMT
9 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 9 TASS—On February 9 Toshiaki Muto, the ambassador of Japan to the USSR, was summoned to the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs where a statement was made to him in connection with hostile actions performed by Japanese extremist elements outside the buildings of Soviet institutions in Japan on February 7 within the framework of the "Day of Northern Territories".

The statement points out, in particular, that the noisy anti-Soviet activities of the Japanese ultrarightists were carried out with connivance on the part of police authorities which did not take any measures to stop them.

The Soviet side repeatedly and at various levels drew the attention of the Japanese side to the need to put a stop to the extremist elements' actions which are hostile to the Soviet Union and which run counter to all norms of relations between states and do a serious damage to bilateral Soviet-Japanese relations. Unfortunately, the situation does not change for the better. One gathers the impression that the Japanese authorities not only ignore the Soviet side's appeals, and virtually shut their eyes to the provocative actions of the extremists but, moreover, morally encourage them, sanctioning the holding of various activities within the framework of the "Day of Northern Territories".

The hostile actions outside the buildings of Soviet institutions in Japan give rise to the greater regret as they take place at a time when there have appeared signs of an improvement of the atmosphere of Soviet-Japanese relations and of an onward movement in practical fields of bilateral contacts.

A resolute protest was lodged with the ambassador of Japan to the USSR in connection with the anti-Soviet actions of extremist organizations in Japan.

The Soviet side expects, the statement of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs points out, that the Japanese authorities, by firmly meeting its international commitments and showing due concern for Soviet-Japanese relations, will take appropriate measures ruling out a recurrence of such actions in the future.

Downturn in Trade With Japan Only Temporary

PM041501 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jan 88
Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent I. Latyshev dispatch: "Encouraging Prospects"]

[Text] Tokyo—The attention of Japanese business circles is currently focused on questions of Japan's economic cooperation with the Soviet Union. The 11th joint session of the Soviet-Japanese and Japanese-Soviet committees for economic cooperation opened in Tokyo 27 January. The conference is to discuss the current state of and prospects for the development of economic ties between the two countries.

The present meeting of senior officials of Soviet economic departments and trade organizations with prominent representatives of the Japanese business world is taking place against the backdrop of a number of difficulties and an appreciable slump in the development of trade relations between our countries. Evidence of this is the reduced turnover, which in 1987 totaled around R2.5 billion, or 20 percent down on the previous year. This marked decrease in the volume of trade between the two countries was primarily the result of a reduction of Japanese exports to the Soviet Union. This was partly due to the diminished competitiveness of Japanese goods in world markets as a result of a sharp rise in the value of the yen, and partly a consequence of the policy of tougher restrictions imposed by Japanese authorities on exports to the Soviet Union of industrial equipment and other goods manufactured by Japanese firms. Specific objective and subjective difficulties have also cropped up in the development of cooperation between the two countries in the implementation of certain general agreements on the joint opening up of natural resources in Siberia and the Far East. It is no accident that Japan's share of the Soviet Union's trade with developed capitalist countries has decreased in recent years in comparison with countries such as the FRG, Britain, and France.

However, in the opinion of many representatives of the Japanese business world, the current difficulties in the development of economic relations between Japan and the Soviet Union are temporary. Local economic experts are well aware that the two countries' economies are capable of developing without acute rivalry and conflicts on the basis of mutually complementary trade exchange.

Experience has convinced the leaders of a number of major companies that the Soviet Union is a reliable and promising partner and that cooperation with this partner is in their interests. These companies have played a leading role in preparing the present conference.

Here is the view of Tomio Tatsuno, president of Marubeni, one of the country's biggest companies:

"Although the general situation in 1987 in the sphere of trade and economic ties between Japan and the Soviet Union was not very favorable, the volume of contracts which our company concluded with the Soviet side increased by 16 percent," he told your correspondent. "Our purchases in the Soviet Union have increased in particular, including purchases of goods such as instruments, paper pulp, chemical fibers, and synthetic rubber. Our contacts with the Soviet Union are expanding. Last year I visited the Soviet Union and submitted proposals for a further expansion of cooperation to leaders of Soviet foreign trade organizations. Currently the company management is studying the question of establishing joint enterprises, including enterprises based on production sharing."

This is the approach to questions of Japanese-Soviet economic cooperation of one prominent and influential representative of the Japanese business world. We wish that this approach were shared by a greater number of leaders of both Japanese business and political circles.

Japan-USSR Economic Talks Reviewed

OW040915 Moscow in Japanese to Japan
1200 GMT 3 Feb 88

[Report by Radio Moscow Tokyo correspondent Pavel Potapov]

[Excerpts] The 11th joint conference of the USSR-Japan and Japan-USSR Economic Committees concluded in Tokyo on 2 February. In this connection, Potapov, our correspondent in Tokyo, filed the following report:

In-depth and constructive views concerning the current situation in economic cooperation between the two countries and prospects for the expansion of such cooperation were exchanged at the four plenary sessions and seven panel discussions held since the start of the conference on 27 January. Messages from Soviet Premier Ryzhkov and Japanese Prime Minister Takeshita were read at the opening session of the joint conference. Both leaders pointed out in their messages the important role of trade and economic cooperation in promoting overall relations between the two countries and expressed their hopes for further development of such cooperation.

The Japanese participants stated their concern over Soviet economic reform, economic management, and foreign trade. As a whole, at the joint conference the two

countries indicated their intention to further develop practical relations between them. This intention was also pointed out in the joint communique adopted on 2 February. [passage omitted]

At the conference, several contracts amounting to \$210 million were concluded. Among them was a contract to build a synthetic fiber complex in the Soviet Union with funds for the project reaching \$140 million. [passage omitted]

At the proposal of the Soviet delegation, discussions were held on expanding the activities of the joint conference of the USSR-Japan and Japan-USSR economic committees. In other words, it was proposed to set up various small committees of experts on joint ventures, joint production, coastal trade, tourism, finance, and banking under the economic committees. The two sides also agreed to hold the next joint conference in the Soviet Union in 1989.

At a press conference held after the joint conference, Anzai, chairman of Tokyo Gas Company who led the Japanese delegation, stated that the joint conference would serve as the starting point for new development in Soviet-Japanese trade and economic relations since the Soviet Union launched drastic reform of its economic management. Delegation leader Anzai also stressed the significance of the joint conference in further strengthening mutual understanding and goodneighborly relations between the two countries.

Malkevich, president of the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry who headed the Soviet delegation, noted the Soviet people's efforts to establish mutually beneficial cooperative relations with Japan in various fields. Delegation leader Malkevich also stated that the two countries should strive to promote new economic relations different from those that existed in the past. He also disclosed that the Soviet side had proposed to the Japanese side that it send a delegation composed of representatives of business circles as well as various government agencies to the Soviet Union this year. Among the objectives of this visit to the Soviet Union would be inspection of joint ventures, study of possibilities of Japan's cooperation in modernizing or restructuring individual enterprises, and discussion of new Japanese cooperative measures aimed at increasing USSR exports to Japan and other countries. [passage omitted]

U.S. Planning Military 'Show of Force'

LD091222 Moscow TASS in English 1157 GMT
9 Feb 88

[Text] New York February 9 TASS—The United States plans a large-scale show of force off South Korea next fall.

The Associated Press reported, quoting U.S. Administration officials, that the war games would begin in the second half of September and continue till early October.

They will involve one or two aircraft-carriers and six to ten escort ships. THE NEW YORK TIMES said that Marine battalions were often attached to such naval groups.

Besides U.S. Air Force planes will be flown to South Korea from Japan.

In addition, the United States and South Korea open an annual "Team Spirit" exercise this month, with 60,000 U.S. servicemen and 140,000 South Korean troops as well as a U.S. aircraft-carrier and several escort ships taking part.

According to a Pentagon spokesman, this exercise, usually staged in February-March, will last till early May this time.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

More on Indonesia's Mokhtar Talks in Moscow

Mokhtar Interviewed

LD062210 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1800 GMT 6 Feb 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] We have already reported that Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja, foreign minister of the Republic of Indonesia, is on a visit to our country. He spoke at the Press Center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs today:

[Correspondent Sturua, identified by caption] Dwelling on the state and future of Soviet-Indonesian political dialogue, the minister stressed that dialogue between our two countries is developing successfully. As for economic relations, these have not yet attained the necessary level, and more could be done in this direction. Our country, Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja announced, has presented two lists of items for trade exchange, and we will of course be very interested to study what the Soviet Union proposes to us in return.

Answering journalists' questions, he said Indonesia advocates the establishment in Southeast Asia of a zone free of nuclear weapons. He also underlined that the recently signed treaty between the USSR and United States on eliminating intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is a good start, a step toward a world with fewer nuclear weapons.

The Indonesian foreign minister gave an interview to the Vremya program:

[Begin recording] [Sturua] Mr Minister, how do you evaluate the meetings and negotiations you have had here in the Soviet Union?

[Mokhtar, in English, with superimposed Russian translation] I think the talks I had with CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Gorbachev and with my colleague, Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, and with other Soviet representatives have been very useful, friendly, and constructive. I am very pleased with these talks. They helped us understand one another better, and I think they will serve as the basis for improved bilateral relations.

[Sturua] And how do you see the further development of our relations?

[Mokhtar] Well, I think that for that, efforts and reciprocal steps are needed by representatives of the two countries at all levels. Development of our relations will correspond to the interests of both peoples. [end recording]

Joint Announcement Issued

PM080945 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Feb 88
Second Edition pp 5-6

["Joint Announcement on the Visit by the Indonesian Minister of Foreign Affairs to the USSR"]

[Text] Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja, foreign minister of the Republic of Indonesia, was in the Soviet Union on an official visit from 4-7 February 1988 at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

The head of the Indonesian foreign policy department laid a wreath at the V.I. Lenin mausoleum and at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin Wall.

The Indonesian foreign minister was received by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. During the meeting, the expansion of relations between the USSR and the Republic of Indonesia on the basis of the principles of sovereign equality, mutual respect, nonintervention in each other's internal affairs, and peaceful coexistence was noted with satisfaction. M.S. Gorbachev stressed that the official visit to the Soviet Union by President Suharto will make a significant contribution to the further development of bilateral relations.

Talks were held between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo USSR minister of foreign affairs, and M. Kusumaatmaja, during which there was an in-depth exchange of views in a friendly and constructive spirit on matters of Soviet-Indonesian relations and key problems of international life.

E.A. Shevardnadze gave a report on the essence of the present stage of the restructuring which is being carried out in the Soviet Union and is aimed at accelerating the

social and economic development of the country on the basis of a radical reform in the management of the economy, widespread democratization, and the renewal of all spheres in the life of Soviet society.

M. Kusumaatmaja announced that Indonesia is following with interest the process that is under way in Soviet society, which is having a favorable influence upon the state of affairs in the world and upon relations between the Soviet Union and the ASEAN Countries.

The ministers subjected the present state of and prospects for Soviet-Indonesian relations to a thorough review and took satisfaction in pointing out their progressive development, which reflects the interest that the peoples of both countries have in further strengthening mutual understanding and in cooperation in various spheres. The mutual striving to continue to deepen contacts, including contacts at the highest level, was confirmed.

Those taking part in the talks gave special attention to discovering ways to increase goods exchange and to establish economic cooperation on a mutually advantageous basis, taking into account all existing potential opportunities. Attention was drawn in this context to the importance of the forthcoming first session of the Joint Soviet-Indonesian Commission for Trade and Economic Cooperation. Both sides expressed their interest in cooperation in using space for peaceful purposes and in mastering the resources of the world ocean, and in other spheres. The intention of further developing interparliamentary ties was confirmed. The sides also agreed to study the opportunities for carrying out exchanges in various spheres.

The ministers conducted an exchange of opinions on issues of the modern international situation, including reducing the military danger and strengthening universal peace and security.

E.A. Shevardnadze briefed M. Kusumaatmaja on the Soviet leadership's evaluation of the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting and the prospects for further disarmament agreements.

M. Kusumaatmaja stressed that Indonesia welcomed the signing between the USSR and the United States of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. He expressed the hope that following the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, agreements would be concluded on reducing strategic offensive and conventional weapons.

Describing the accords reached in Washington as a real movement toward true disarmament, the ministers noted their positive influence on the course of world events and the creation of a favorable atmosphere for the resolution of regional problems by peaceful political means.

A unity of views emerged during the talks with regard to the need to strive to strengthen general peace and security, including the fulfillment of the relevant decisions of the United Nations General Assembly, preventing the militarization of space, ending nuclear weapons tests, and concluding an international treaty on their complete and comprehensive prohibition. The sides noted the importance of energetic efforts within the framework of the Geneva disarmament conference toward a most speedy conclusion of a convention prohibiting the development, manufacture, accumulation, and use of chemical weapons, and dealing with their destruction.

The ministers agreed that it is necessary to assist the strengthening of peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region by practical steps. They reached the common view that the establishment of widespread and mutually beneficial cooperation with equal rights between the states located here is a reliable guarantee for the removal of the military threat and the improvement of the political atmosphere in this region of the globe. The Soviet side stressed that the buildup of efforts to implement the initiatives expounded by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in Vladivostok, Delhi, and in replies to questions of the newspaper MERDEKA would meet these aims.

The Soviet Union and Indonesia called for the urgent implementation of the UN declaration and also the relevant United Nations General Assembly resolutions on turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace, and advocated convening an international conference on this matter no later than 1990.

The Indonesian foreign minister expounded the point of view of the ASEAN countries, which was formulated in the final documents of the third meeting of heads of government of the association's member-states, in regard to the situation now taking shape in Southeast Asia, and to the ways of eliminating regional tension. The common view of those taking part in the talks is that realizing the idea of turning Southeast Asia into a nuclear-free zone would be a substantial contribution toward strengthening peace in the region.

E.A. Shevardnadze welcomed the constructive initiatives and practical steps being carried out by the countries of Southeast Asia that are aimed at normalizing the situation and at consolidating stable peace and good neighborly relations in this region. He also confirmed the USSR's readiness to continue to assist in every possible way the progress of efforts in the given direction, at the regional and international levels.

M. Kusumaatmaja talked about the efforts he has recently exerted in search of such a solution. These met with the approval and support of the Soviet side.

Both sides are convinced that the Cambodian issue can be resolved only by political means and by the Cambodian people themselves by means of talks between all interested parties. They declared their approval of the policy of national reconciliation in Cambodia.

In their exchange of views on the situation in other parts of the world, the ministers were unanimous that the achievement of an all-embracing and just settlement in the Near East is possible only on the basis of the convening of an international conference with the participation of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council and all interested sides, including the PLO—the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

Both sides stressed the need for the speediest possible cessation of the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq and its transfer into the channel of a political settlement with account being taken of the legitimate interests of both sides in accordance with UN Security Council Resolution 598.

E.A. Shevardnadze drew attention to the Soviet proposals for a normalization of the situation in the Persian Gulf, including the proposal on the withdrawal from this area of the ships of non-littoral states and the formation of a UN naval force.

The ministers stressed the insistent need to find a political solution to the Afghan problem in the interests of peace and stability in Asia. It was explained to the Indonesian side that the initiatives that have been taken of late by the Governments of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union to achieve an Afghan settlement create the essential prerequisites for the working out of final accords at the Afghan-Pakistan negotiations being conducted in Geneva through D. Cordovez, personal representative of the UN secretary general.

Calling upon the international community to coordinate efforts in the struggle to eliminate the apartheid system in the RSA and for the immediate granting of independence to Namibia in strict accord with the decisions of the OAU and the United Nations, and also to cooperate in guaranteeing the security of the Frontline States of southern Africa, the sides underlined the need for urgent introduction of all-embracing and obligatory sanctions against the RSA.

The ministers drew attention to the growing role of the Nonaligned Movement in the struggle for a nuclear-free world, guaranteeing universal peace and security, strengthening the national independence of states, and establishing a new international economic order. They expressed the hope that this would find due reflection in the decisions of the movement's forums to be held this year.

The sides advocated the necessity of securing stability and predictability in international economic relations and advocated the development of broad, mutually advantageous trade and economic cooperation between all countries, regardless of their social structure.

The Soviet Union and Indonesia advocate deepening interaction in international affairs and expanding the practice of bilateral political consultations at various levels on the key problems of modern times. During the course of the visit, a protocol was signed between the USSR and the Republic of Indonesia on bilateral consultations.

Both sides are convinced that this visit and the exchange of opinions that has been held will facilitate the further development of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Indonesia and the strengthening of mutual understanding and trust between them.

M. Kusumaatmaja expressed gratitude for the warm reception and hospitality shown to him and the members of the delegation during the visit.

The Indonesian minister of foreign affairs invited E.A. Shevardnadze to make an official visit to Indonesia. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

Mokhtar Departure Statement Reported

*LD071303 Moscow TASS in English 1223 GMT
7 Feb 88*

[Text] Moscow February 7 TASS—"As a result of the talks in Moscow we laid a solid foundation for a further consolidation of relations between our two countries", Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja, minister of foreign affairs of Indonesia, said in a TASS interview today before leaving Moscow.

He pointed out that his talks with Soviet leaders had been a success. They had been cordial and constructive. There is no doubt that the talks will promote the consolidation of mutual understanding and the development of cooperation between the Republic of Indonesia and the Soviet Union.

Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja expressed high appreciation of the changes taking place in the USSR which, in his opinion, will promote between the two countries in various spheres, specifically, in the sphere of trade and economy. He spoke out in favour of the continuation and development of Soviet-Indonesian political dialogue and pointed out the need for new concrete steps on various levels on the basis of the positive results reached in the course of this visit.

Seen Off at Departure

*BK071324 Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia
1300 GMT 7 Feb 88*

[Excerpts] Talks in Moscow between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his Indonesian counterpart Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja have ended. [passage omitted]

Indonesian Foreign Minister Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja left Moscow today. At the Moscow airport, Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja was seen off by Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Soviet foreign minister, Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev, Soviet Ambassador to Indonesia Semenov, and other Soviet officials. Indonesian Ambassador to the USSR Sugantio Kusumodigdo and chiefs of diplomatic mission of Southeast Asian countries in Moscow were also present at the airport.

Sihanouk Proposals Unacceptable in Cambodia

*OW090203 Moscow Television Service in Russian
2335 GMT 8 Feb 88*

[Ye. Kochanov video report from Phnom Penh; from the Novosti newscast]

[Text] Our correspondent Yevgeniy Kochanov reports from the People's Republic of Kampuchea on the progress of national reconciliation.

[Kochanov, seen standing on a street in Phnom Penh] [Begin recording] People in the People's Republic of Kampuchea are keenly watching the twists and turns of the complex political dialogue which has developed around the Cambodian problem.

Some news is received with approval, and other reports are met with bewilderment and at times even with indignation. This was precisely the reaction here to the recent demands of Prince Sihanouk to dissolve the People's Republic of Kampuchea as a main condition for national reconciliation. This demand was made despite the fact that the central government and local authorities are functioning effectively in the country.

The National Assembly, Cambodia's parliament which was lawfully elected by the people, is in session. [video shows Assembly, speakers] Presently, a scheduled session of the assembly is taking place in Phnom Penh. Questions of vital importance are being discussed by the deputies: a report on the fulfillment over the past 2 years of the social-economic plan for the development of the country; a rough outline for the future; the military and political situation in the country; and the activities of the counter-revolutionary groups. This issue too has been thoroughly discussed by the deputies. And finally, the most important of all: the results of the policy of national reconciliation, which has already brought positive results in the international arena and, even more so, on the

domestic front. Literally within months, the words "national reconciliation"—previously hardly understood by anyone at all—have become catchwords close to the hearts of all Cambodians.

One of the important documents passed by the Cambodian parliament is the statement of support for the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting which took place early in October in Washington. The statement says that the situation which formed in the world after the Washington meeting gives rise to the hope for a just political solution to the Cambodian problems and which would put an end to the sufferings of the Cambodian people.

Near East & South Asia

Vorontsov Arrives in Pakistan for Talks

*LD100931 Moscow TASS in English 0920 GMT
10 Feb 88*

[Text] Islamabad February 10 TASS—Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Vorontsov arrived here today for talks with the Pakistani leadership in connection with the statement on Afghanistan made by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Vorontsov was welcomed at Islamabad airport by Pakistan's First Deputy Foreign Minister Abdus Sattar.

Cordovez Continues Talks on Afghanistan

'Positively' Assesses Results

*LD091837 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT
9 Feb 88*

[Text] Islamabad February 9 TASS—Diego Cordovez, personal envoy of the United Nations secretary-general, today held a news conference here on the results of his visit to the region with a view to preparing another round of Afghan-Pakistani talks in Geneva with U.N. Mediation.

Cordovez summed up positively the results of his talks with the leaders of Afghanistan and Pakistan. He said he had been able successfully to cope with the tasks facing him as the mediator.

In his opinion, it has proved possible to prepare the new round of the negotiations, which opens in Geneva on March 2, well.

Cordovez said the sides had reached an understanding on the schedule for the Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan and on arrangements to monitor the implementation of the agreement.

He said that the sides had agreed also that the larger part of Soviet troops was to be returned home at the initial phase of the withdrawal.

He said it was planned during the forthcoming round of the talks to work out practical terms and the very mechanism for the Soviet troops withdrawal and monitoring arrangements.

The verification issue, Cordovez said, was sealed in a separate document which would be supplemented with specific provisions concerning the troop withdrawal and signed along with the main agreement. He added that the remaining details would be thrashed out and recorded clearly in the final documents.

Speaking of the Soviet position on settling the situation regarding Afghanistan, Cordovez said he could feel a new approach to the issue on the part of the Soviet leader.

Replying to questions from correspondents, Cordovez said there was now a general awareness of the need to form an Afghan government which would be widely representative of all sections of the Afghan people. Besides, he added, the issue of forming the next government should be decided only by the Afghans themselves.

Cordovez said the main difficulties during his stay in the region had been connected with overcoming profound mutual mistrust, but that had not prevented the draft agreement from being worked out in details.

The personal envoy of the U.N. secretary-general said he had been given assurances by the Americans that the United States supported the drafted documents.

He said a characteristic feature of the draft was that it provided for possibilities to make changes and activate a mechanism of response in the event of the understandings being violated.

The United Nations, Cordovez stressed, would continue playing an important role also when the Geneva agreement was being realized.

Arrives in Geneva

LD101225 Moscow TASS in English 1207 GMT
10 Feb 88

[Text] Geneva February 10 TASS—Diego Cordovez, personal representative of the U.N. secretary-general at the Afghan-Pakistani talks, arrived in Geneva on Tuesday on his way from Islamabad to New York.

Speaking before journalists he said that he was busy preparing the next round of talks. He noted that the talks would be held on previous conditions and with the same composition. No new issues or conditions had been raised. The participants in the talks would arrive to finalise the texts. Cordovez said that he made his trip to Islamabad thoroughly to prepare the next round of talks. He stressed that that goal had been achieved. Both parties at the talks were vigorously supporting the Geneva process.

Afghan Official Welcomes Gorbachev Statement LD100925 Moscow TASS in English 0837 GMT 10 Feb 88

[Text] Tripoli February 10 TASS—The Afghan foreign minister has stressed the immense significance of Mikhail Gorbachev's statement on Afghanistan.

Abdul Wakil, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, on a visit here, said to a TASS correspondent that the good will shown by the Soviet Union would be undoubtedly understood and welcomed throughout the world.

"The enemies of national reconciliation in Afghanistan now have no arguments left."

The statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the minister said, "is a response to Western propaganda media speculations on the dates of the withdrawal of the limited contingent of Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

The Afghan leadership, President Najibullah support that statement which paves the way for the settlement of the situation relating to our country and for the solution of a number of its domestic issues."

Assessing Gorbachev's statement from the viewpoint of the forthcoming round of Afghan-Pakistani talks, Wakil noted that the stance taken by the Soviet and the Afghan leadership should facilitate their success.

"We hope that the Pakistani side will appreciate the flexibility of the Soviet Union and Afghanistan and display good will as well, and the agreement will be signed," the Afghan minister said.

"We want an end to bloodshed in our country so that people could at last have a chance to live and work in peaceful conditions.

The policy of national reconciliation is bearing its fruit, and we are sure that the situation in the country will be normalized as soon as the main destabilizing factor, imperialist interference in our internal affairs, is removed.

Of course, some problems will remain, but they can be resolved through skilful and flexible policies.

The settlement of the situation around Afghanistan will not only improve the atmosphere in the region, but will also make a great contribution to peace around the world."

Weekly Cites U.S. Journalist on Dushman Killings
PM091522 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian 10 Feb 88 p 9

[Own correspondent Iona Andronov report under the rubric "Behind the Scenes": "Shashlik, Dushman Style"]

[Text] New York—Richard Erlich, a well known staffer of the WASHINGTON TIMES newspaper, recently returned from an assignment in Afghanistan. American journalists have before now made many Afghan trips, often illegally. But this Afghan tour by Erlich differs from previous visits by his colleagues. The Washington newspaperman refrained from contacting dushman gangs in Afghanistan. Instead, he first obtained official permission from the Afghan authorities to visit Kabul, Herat, Balkh, Mazar-e Sharif, and other cities. And then, in the Pakistani border city of Peshawar, he enlisted the protection of the local police for only a brief meeting with one of the dushmans' ringleaders. This caution is all the more unusual in that Erlich is a correspondent for an extremely reactionary and anti-Soviet newspaper. So why is he afraid of the dushmans?

"The large CIA-financed rebel grouping Hezb-e Islami, headed by its chieftain Hekmatyar," Erlich explains, "is now robbing and murdering Western journalists."

When Erlich asked Hekmatyar in Peshawar why his cutthroats robbed and killed BBC correspondent Andy Skrzypkowiak, who had made his way into Afghanistan, the answer was: "Your Andy, as far as we know, was working for the intelligence services." And now Erlich claims indignantly:

"Hekmatyar's fighters receive one-third of all the CIA's secret supplies to the Afghan rebels, and as part of the bargain, Washington issued to him, first among the dushmans, the sophisticated Stinger antiaircraft missiles, but today Hekmatyar denies receiving Stingers and CIA aid."

Why? Because, according to Erlich, the dushmans' leader is taking a long-term view in this political masquerade: portraying himself, before all the Afghans, as an incorruptible patriot on the eve of the anticipated international agreements on noninterference in Afghanistan's affairs. Three weeks ago, Hekmatyar, an old CIA accomplice, shamelessly told a NEW YORK TIMES correspondent who visited him: "Now the CIA is intriguing against me." Meanwhile, according to American journalists, he is stockpiling weapons received from the United States in order to rout all the other dushman gangs. Hekmatyar has already proclaimed himself Afghanistan's sole standard bearer of orthodox Islam and concluded an alliance with the ruling Iranian mullahs. Erlich complains:

"Several worried Western diplomats in Kabul make no secret of the fact that they are planning temporarily to evacuate Afghanistan if the Soviet military units withdraw, after which the exacerbation of rivalry among the Afghan rebels could cause a bloody carnage."

Unlike the prudent Erlich, his colleagues Richard Mackenzie and Anthony Davis [as transliterated] secretly made their way into Afghanistan 2 months ago and were seized there by Hekmatyar's men, robbed, and condemned to death. Three days later both were pardoned, but only because their Afghan companions tempted the butchers with a rich ransom—precious stones. After this, Mackenzie, finding himself in Peshawar, saw dushmans in the bazaar selling the possessions of the BBC correspondent they had killed. The property of robbed Frenchmen was also being sold. And back in October, American television men James Lindelof and Lee Shapiro [names as transliterated] died. But their bodies have not yet been handed over for burial. The dushmans are also demanding a large ransom for the body of the murdered American newspaperman Charles Thornton, who was in reality their military instructor.

By a bitter irony of fate, a shashlik shop has been opened on 9th Avenue in New York by a dushman who has grown rich, one Mohammad Mirza [as transliterated], who advertises in the local newspapers his "aromatic dish made from blood." Let us hope none of the Americans fall under the knives of their dushman shashlik merchants!

Dobrynin Receives Indian Defense Minister
LD091956 Moscow TASS in English 1921 GMT
9 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 9 TASS—Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Dobrynin today had a meeting with India's Defence Minister Krishna Chandra Pant, who is on an official friendly visit in the Soviet Union.

They discussed questions of Soviet-Indian cooperation and also some international problems of interest to the two countries.

The Indian ambassador in the USSR Triloki Nath Kaul took part in the conversation which passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Coup in South African Homeland Reported
LD100735 Moscow TASS in English 0731 GMT
10 Feb 88

[Text] Maputo February 10 TASS—A military "coup" has been staged in the pseudo-independent South African Bantustan Bophuthatswana. As South African radio said in the morning today, army men have overthrown

the civil administration of that reservation for the Africans set up by the Pretoria rulers within the framework of the apartheid policy. According to the radio, the "coup" was a bloodless one. "President" Lucas Mangope has been arrested. The local population has been ordered not to report to work and stay at home.

Bophuthatswana is one of the four Bantustans proclaimed by the South African authorities as "independent states" to create an illusion of a resolution of the racial problem in the country. None of them have so far been recognized by a single state in the world.

Last year, a similar "change of power" was staged by the Pretoria authorities in another Bantustan — Transkei.

RSA, U.S. Accused of Chemical Warfare

MB060635 Moscow Radio in English to South Africa
1800 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Commentary by Vladisev Ilinar]

[Text] The South African newspaper, SUNDAY TIMES, and, following it, the Western news agencies, report that Angolan troops use chemical weapons against the anti-government grouping, UNITA. What lies behind the accusation—facts or vicious concoctions? I can remind listeners that evidence has been quoted in the press of African countries on many occasions that it is the racist South African regime that uses chemical weapons against patriots.

For example, last summer information became available that South Africa manufactures, under American licenses, components for chemical and biological arms, and that it had already made use in Namibia of phosphorous bombs, napalm, and the Agent Orange defoliant. The Accra-based newspaper GHANANIAN TIMES wrote recently that Pretoria is supplied toxic chemicals to its mercenaries in Angola and Mozambique. (It has also) been reported that South Africa secretly cooperates with the United States in developing ethnic weapons, which have already been tried on human beings in the Oshakati concentration camp in Namibia. That report caused great irritation in Washington but was not refuted.

Now, all of a sudden, there appear accusations by South Africa against Angola which allegedly uses chemical weapons. This is an old trick of ascribing to others what one is doing oneself. It is enough to recall the provocation with the so-called yellow rain made by Washington several years ago. The idea was to accuse the Soviet Union of using warfare chemicals—and in southeast Asia into the bargain—which the United States had used during its aggression as a proving ground for chemical weapons. The Americans had dropped there millions of tons of the Agent Orange defoliant, the effects of which are still felt by residents of (Japan). As it is known, the yellow rain operation was a flop.

It comes to my mind, in view of the tales spread by the South African racists, I would say that in this case the apartheid regime has borrowed the American experience not only in developing methods to kill silently with chemical arms, but also in conducting loud campaigns of slander.

Gromyko Receives Mali's Traore

LD082104 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1903 GMT 8 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow, 8 Feb—Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, met today with Moussa Traore, secretary general of the Mali People's Democratic Union and president of the Republic, who is in the Soviet Union on an unofficial visit. The eminent guest was accompanied by Abdoulaye Amadou Sy, Mali's ambassador to the USSR. They exchanged views on a broad range of international issues, primarily on problems in African politics. The sides also discussed bilateral Soviet-Malian relations.

In the view of M. Traore, the tasks of the eastern, central, and western African countries consist in defusing all conflict between the countries of these regions and directing all their energies toward economic development. The African countries are particularly concerned about their debts. They are obliged to pay off most of their debts with raw materials, and the prices for these raw materials are fixed by others.

A.A. Gromyko said: You are describing the situation precisely. And this is the fundamental matter.

M. Traore said: The Soviet Union's position differs from this fundamentally. I consider bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and African countries to be brilliant. The USSR respects their independence and tries to promote economic development.

The Malian president described the explosive situation in southern Africa. The RSA is openly threatening Angola. The African states are continuing the struggle to protect the independence of Angola and against linking the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola with granting independence to Namibia. The people of this African territory must be granted the opportunity to determine their own destiny.

It was noted on the Soviet side that the dispatch of a contingent of Cuban troops to Angola is a noble action on the part of the Latin American state. As concerns Namibia, the matter of its independence, of course, is of independent significance. But by virtue of the geographic proximity of Angola and Namibia, their political problems are organically connected. The Soviet Union immutably advocates Namibian independence and the inviolability of the Angolan borders.

Concluding the discussion on Africa, A.A. Gromyko stressed: It would be good if full agreement on inter-African problems dominated relations among countries on the continent. Imperialist circles would derive the greatest pleasure from Africa's political division. However, unity does not fall from the sky. Everyone now knows how much work is necessary to strengthen it. The sympathy and political efforts of the Soviet Union in the international arena will always be on the side of those who uphold their independence and freedom.

The interlocutors exchanged opinions concerning the situation in the Near East and expressed the common point of view that the one correct way to resolve the crisis in the region is through an international conference on the Near East with all interested parties taking part, including the Palestinian Liberation Organization as a full participant. A.A. Gromyko stressed that no one has yet thought of a more perfect way to resolve international problems than to discuss them with all interested parties taking part. The convening of an international conference meets that goal in this case, too.

A common view was expressed regarding the Iran-Iraq war. It is senseless, and the sooner the sides cease the bloodshed, the better it will be both for the peoples involved in the conflict and for all neighboring states, which feel to some degree or another the tension in the region and live constantly under the threat of the conflict spreading. Nowadays, A.A. Gromyko noted, to put it figuratively, if fire breaks out at one end of the earth, people at the other end should help extinguish it.

M. Traore stated that his country welcomes the signing of the historic Soviet-U.S. treaty on scrapping intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. The people of Mali are also struggling for peace and, therefore, fully support the Soviet Union's steps toward disarmament.

A.A. Gromyko stressed that ratification of this treaty should be the next important step. The Soviet Union hopes that the United States will approach this act with the greatest responsibility and that the forces of reason will triumph. The accords that have already been achieved testify to the real opportunities for finding new, mutually acceptable solutions, including one on the matter of a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive armaments. It is understandable that further steps will not be at all easy. However, it is important not to lose momentum or, most importantly, common sense. The Soviet Union does not intend to rest on what has been achieved. It will do everything to ensure that progress toward the ideal of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world continues.

A.A. Gromyko spoke of the great work being done to implement the CPSU's plans for developing the Soviet state. This is a program of restructuring in the most profound and fullest sense of the word. The key features of the present stage of restructuring are to turn the plan into practical action, to fully open up the enormous

creative possibilities of socialism, and to make the most effective use of these to benefit the Soviet people. This goes for the economic, social, and intellectual spheres of Soviet society.

The organic link was stressed between the plans for internal development and Soviet foreign policy, the thrust of which is directed at strengthening peace and improving the lives of peoples of all countries.

M. Traore displayed a lively interest in the progress of restructuring in the USSR and remarked on its great international significance. He in turn told of the difficult economic and social problems being tackled in Mali, and of the preparations for the third regular congress of the Mali People's Democratic Union.

The meeting's participants expressed satisfaction at the state of friendly Soviet-Malian relations. It was stressed that, in the sphere of bilateral economic cooperation, it is important to concentrate efforts to implement the accords that exist between the USSR and Mali, and to search for new and effective mutually beneficial links. The growing contacts in the parliamentary field—between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Malian National Congress—are playing a positive role.

In conclusion, A.A. Gromyko stated that, though separated by a great distance, the countries can extend their hands to one another. And no obstacles can get in the way of this.

The Malian president conveyed his immense gratitude to the Soviet leadership and to M.S. Gorbachev personally for the reception he was accorded in Moscow. The meeting passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Ryuytel Delegation Ends Visit to Cape Verde
LD062028 Moscow TASS in English 1944 GMT
6 Feb 88

[Text] Bissau February 6 TASS—A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by Arnold Ryuytel, vice president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has ended its official visit to the republic of Cape Verde.

During the visit the delegation had an exchange of information on the activities of the parliaments of the two countries, and discussed urgent international issues and bilateral relations. The Soviet delegation visited a number of regions in the country, familiarised themselves with the activities of local bodies of government. The Soviet MPs were received by President of the Republic of Cape Verde Aristides Pereira, Prime Minister Pedro Verona Pires and Chairman of the National People's Assembly Abilio Monteiro Duarte.

The delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet left for the USSR today.

Ethiopia Winning War With 'Separatists'

PM091447 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jan 88
Second Edition p 4

[Own correspondent I. Tarutin dispatch: "In the North of Ethiopia"]

[Excerpts] Addis Ababa, Asmara, Jan—[passage omitted] Eritrea's historical development has been complex. The Italians, who left in 1941, were replaced by the British. Only in 1952, by decision of the UN General Assembly, was Eritrea reunited with Ethiopia on a federal basis. Ten years later it became one of the country's provinces.

However, its trials did not end there. In the early sixties separatist movements sprung up which set themselves the aim of breaking away from Ethiopia. Their emergence was facilitated by the fact that the imperial regime conducted a policy of national oppression against various ethnic minorities, especially Muslims, of whom there are many in Eritrea.

After the overthrow of the monarchy, the new authorities proclaimed the equality of all ethnic groups and embarked upon measures to resolve Eritrea's problems by peaceful means. However, the separatists, incited by external reaction which was hoping through them to deal a lethal blow to the revolution, launched military actions. However, the splittists failed to achieve their aims. During the years since the revolution, many separatists have laid down their arms and surrendered.

On the outskirts of Asmara, in a quiet alley behind a low fence, there is a center for those who want to voluntarily switch to the government's side. They spend 3 months at the center. During this time, the policy of the revolutionary authorities is explained to the former separatists. Those who are illiterate, which is most of them, are taught to read and write, and attempts are made to teach them the rudiments of some trade or other.

Meleka Gyrma [name as transliterated] has spent 15 of his 30 years among the separatists. He joined them back under the emperor. I was young, he relates; I believed I was fighting the exploiters. I took part in many battles even after the revolution. They tried to convince us that we were fighting for socialism. And for a long time I believed them. Then I saw that our leaders were receiving weapons from the West and that they were destroying national assets. Gradually I began to understand that the truth is on the other side.

More than 12,000 people have already passed through the center. In recent years the exodus from the separatist ranks has risen. The separatists are opposed not only by the regular army but also the people's militia, that is, the local inhabitants themselves who have been issued with weapons for their protection. I saw one such self-defense detachment in Liban [name as transliterated] village. [passage omitted]

Radical changes are taking place throughout the province, I was told by Tefera Wonde, deputy chairman of the country's Council of Ministers who, prior to his appointment to this post, was for a number of years first secretary of the Workers' Party of Ethiopia [WPE] committee in Eritrea. The separatists are finding it harder and harder to mislead the people despite their sophisticated propaganda campaign. People see the destructive impact of separatism. The separatists have lost their social basis and have to rely on Western support.

Even a few years ago it was not all that easy to get people to join public organizations. Now trade unions and peasant and youth associations have many thousands of members. The WPE has carried out a great deal of organizational work in this respect. The party is persistently seeking to improve the working people's living conditions. True, the drought has dealt us a serious blow. However, party and state organs are doing everything possible to counter the impact of the calamity which has befallen us.

Together with the rest of the country, Eritrea played an active part in the proclamation of the republic. Elections to the National Assembly—the country's parliament—were successfully held. In the referendum on the draft constitution, 87.5 of the voters voted in favor. The separatists tried to thwart the referendum but they failed, Tefera Wonde said in conclusion.

Of course, it would be premature to talk about the total collapse of the separatist movement as yet. It still numbers thousands of seasoned and well-armed people in its ranks. And the skillful gambling on nationalism is still bearing fruit. However, this is becoming more and more difficult with every passing year. Especially now that the first session of the National Assembly has granted Eritrea broad autonomy. "Shengo"—the province's supreme legislative body—has been authorized to pass its own laws on condition that they are not at variance with the republic's Constitution, and to draft a local budget, development plans, and much else.

A joint appeal from representatives of Eritrea's mass organizations and diverse associations to the separatists has been published. It says in part: "The time has come to end the fratricidal war. The time has come to put an end to the tragedy, suffering, hunger, death, and bloodshed which it has caused." What is there to add to this? The Eritreans want a normal life, they want peace to be established forever.

AUCCTU To Send Aid to Mozambique

PM081545 Moscow TRUD in Russian 2 Feb 88
p 3

[Unattributed report: "Humanitarian Assistance"]

[Text] With the aim of giving assistance to Mozambican working people and refugees suffering as the result of natural calamities—droughts—and armed excesses by

counterrevolutionary gangs, the AUCCTU has decided to send Mozambique shipments, including rice, baby food, canned sardines, blankets, bedlinen, and cotton fabrics, as an expression of Soviet trade union solidarity.

These aid shipments will be dispatched as soon as possible on Aeroflot scheduled flights to Maputo for the Organization of the Working People of Mozambique.

East Europe

Poland's Orzechowski on Official Visit to Moscow

Honors Soviet Heroes

LD091525 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0830 GMT 9 Feb 88

[Text] Orzechowski, member of the Politburo of the PZPR Central Committee and Poland's foreign minister, is in our country on an official friendly visit. He has been invited by the Soviet Government.

Today, Comrade Orzechowski laid a wreath on the mausoleum of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. A wreath was also laid on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at the Kremlin Wall. Wreaths were also laid at the graves of Feliks Edmunovich Dzerzhinskiy and Konstantin Konstantinovich Rokossovskiy in the Kremlin Wall.

Received by Gromyko

LD091949 Moscow TASS in English 1920 GMT
9 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 9 TASS—Andrey Gromyko received Marian Orzechowski, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, minister of foreign affairs of the Polish People's Republic, who is currently in Moscow on an official friendly visit, in the Kremlin today.

During the discussion of key international issues Andrey Gromyko emphasized that the signing of the INF Treaty between the Soviet Union and the United States had become a manifestation of the new political thinking and of a sober-minded assessment of the entire complexity of the international situation.

Having drawn the attention of the Polish foreign minister to Mikhail Gorbachev's statement on Afghanistan, Andrey Gromyko emphasized that "the Soviet Union's line is to create conditions for a withdrawal of the limited contingent of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. This is why the statement gives specific dates".

"The Soviet Union adheres to its strategic line, and subsequently, appropriate matters will be resolved concretely within each individual period of time. Our strategic line in foreign affairs is oriented towards peace, not war. This is why the resolution of the 'Afghan issue', in our view, will become a big contribution to the cause of peace throughout the world", Andrey Gromyko said.

"We want to see Afghanistan as a truly neutral and non-aligned state. We are confident that this policy through its persuasiveness attracts other states as well," Andrey Gromyko pointed out.

PAP on Gromyko Meeting

LD092306 Warsaw PAP in English 2230 GMT
9 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow, Feb. 9—PUWP CC Political Bureau member, Poland's Foreign Affairs Minister Marian Orzechowski, now on an official visit of friendship to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet Government, today was received by member of the CPSU CC Political Bureau, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Andrey Gromyko.

While discussing key international issues, Gromyko stressed that the signing of the treaty between the USSR and the U.S. on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles was a manifestation of new political thinking and a sober taking into account of the whole complexity of the international situation. This event undoubtedly has immense historical significance. There is no exaggeration in this statement, Gromyko said.

Gromyko presented the Soviet point of view on some significant lines of the foreign policy pursued by the Soviet state. He drew the Polish foreign minister's attention to the very important statement of CPSU CC General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev on Afghanistan which was published in the press on Tuesday.

Minister Orzechowski stressed that he listened to the statement with great interest yesterday when it was aired on television.

Gromyko underscored that the Soviet Union's line of action consisted in creating conditions for the withdrawal of a limited contingent of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. That was why the statement names concrete dates.

The Soviet Union maintains its strategic line. In the future, at all times, respective problems will be solved in a concrete manner. Our strategic line on international matters aims not at war but at peace, Gromyko stated. That is why the solution of the "Afghan issue" is, in the opinion of the Soviet Union, an important contribution to the cause of peace worldwide. We wish for Afghanistan to be really neutral and non-aligned state. We are convinced that such a policy inspires other countries through its power of persuasion, he said.

Gromyko spoke about the deep character of the perestroika in the Soviet Union, about the broad plane which it has created for the economic activities of enterprises as well as its consistency in further strengthening socialism.

In the afternoon Minister Orzechowski met at the Polish Embassy here with the party-professional active of Polish representations in the capital of the USSR.

Polish-Soviet talks presided over by Minister Orzechowski and member of the CPSU CC Political Bureau, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union Eduard Shevardnadze also began today. They will be continued on Wednesday.

In the evening, Ministers Orzechowski and Shevardnadze signed an "agreement Between the Government of the Polish People's Republic and the Government of the Soviet Union on the Setting Up and Activities of the Polish Information and Culture Centre in the Soviet Union."

Cultural Accord Signed

LD091726 Moscow TASS in English 1653 GMT
9 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 9 TASS—Talks started in Moscow today between Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, and Marian Orzechowski, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party and foreign minister of Poland, in the USSR on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

The ministers signed an agreement between the Governments of the USSR and Poland on the establishment and operation of Poland's information and cultural centre in the Soviet Union.

Shevardnadze Hosts Dinner

LD101313 Warsaw PAP in English 1212 GMT
10 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow, Feb. 10—On Wednesday, Polish Foreign Affairs Minister Marian Orzechowski, who is paying an official visit of friendship to the Soviet Union, was received by CPSU CC General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev (the meeting will be covered separately).

Eduard Shevardnadze, the Soviet minister of foreign affairs, gave an official dinner in honour of the Polish guest. The dinner was attended by CPSU CC Secretary Vadim Medvedev, Deputy Premier Aleksey Antonov and other officials, as well as Poland's Ambassador to the Soviet Union Wlodzimierz Natorf and the Soviet Ambassador to Poland Vladimir Brovikov. Toasts were given by Eduard Shevardnadze and Marian Orzechowski.

Interviewed On Cooperation

LD092150 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1550 GMT 9 Feb 88

[From "The World Today" program presented by Dmitriy Biryukov]

[Text] [Biryukov] Marian Orzechowski, PZPR Central Committee politburo member and Polish foreign minister, is in Moscow on an official friendly visit. Today, together with Polish television correspondent in Moscow Witold Stefanowicz, I interviewed Comrade Orzechowski:

[Begin recording; all speakers in Polish with superimposed Russian translation] [Stefanowicz] Comrade Minister, your interview today is being conducted by television correspondents from two countries. Allow me, as agreed upon with my colleague, to ask the first question. Speaking of cooperation between our states, can one speak of qualitative changes in it?

[Orzechowski] I think one not only can but needs to. One should realize that in Poland, and evidently not just in Poland, we all realize that a new stage of cooperation is beginning. What is it based on? Our relations have had a good permanent foundation for nearly 42 years now. Primarily, this new stage is connected with the changes taking place in the Soviet Union and Poland. Real cooperation, genuine trust, and clear understanding—an understanding clearer than ever before—that we need each other. Poland needs the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union needs Poland. The new stage is also a search for new forms of cooperation. I would like to draw attention to the fact that our cooperation, the friendship between us, is shedding certain elements of window-dressing and showiness, and is being taken up as the cause of each member of our society. The search is for new, more effective forms of cooperation in the field of economics, decentralization, bringing the great slogans of friendship, cooperation, and mutual aid to the people and citizens.

[Stefanowicz] Here we have a modest bit of television in the form of a joint interview.

[Orzechowski] Yes, you could call it that.

[Biryukov] My question concerns Jaruzelski's plan. Comrade Minister, that plan is widely known in our country, the USSR. How has it been received around the world?

[Orzechowski] We are very glad the plan is known in the Soviet Union. I would like to say, first of all, that the support for this plan from the Soviet Union and our socialist allies has also been a source of popularity for it and for the weight it carries around the world. The plan has been received positively, and I think this appraisal is being consolidated. For instance, when General Jaruzelski brought out the plan on 8 May, we had not

foreseen then that the signing of the treaty in Washington would take place. The scrapping of two types of missiles creates a new situation in Europe, and this situation is ideally in keeping with Jaruzelski's plan. Thus, interest is growing; the number of debates is increasing. We are now at the stage of completing the first round of consultations with interested partner states. We are working on the concretization of individual points in the plan. I think we will soon submit the new document containing the proposals based on the ideas, remarks, and addenda of our comrades and partners to whom the plan is addressed.

[Biryukov] My second question concerns the problems of reduction of missiles. Comrade Minister, how do you assess the treaty ratification process between the USSR and United States currently underway in Washington and Moscow?

[Orzechowski] I think, without going into details and expressing our wishes and desires, I can say I am convinced that good sense will triumph, realism will triumph, and the logic contained in the Washington agreement will triumph. Logically, it creates a real possibility of taking still more important steps in disarmament. As for the USSR's position, I am convinced—Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said this—that the Soviet side will ratify the treaty. I hope realism and good sense will triumph in the United States as well.

[Stefanowicz] How did you receive yesterday's statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on the decision to withdraw Soviet troops from Afghanistan?

[Orzechowski] Frankly—and perhaps a politician should not say such things—with huge satisfaction and still more relief. We all realize what the situation in Afghanistan and around Afghanistan is, what consequences it has for international politics and for the international situation and climate. The statement was further confirmation of the principled position of the Soviet Union on this question. I think it was confirmation of the new thinking, the search for solutions reflecting the interests of the people of Afghanistan and the whole world. So, again, with great relief and huge satisfaction, I am very thankful for the meeting. Thank you. [end recording]

West Europe

FRG's Spaeth Continues Visit to Moscow

Meets With Gorbachev

LD091821 Moscow TASS in English 1815 GMT
9 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 9 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev met in the Kremlin today with Lothar Spaeth, minister-president of Baden-Wuerttemberg, deputy chairman of the Christian Democratic Union of West Germany. They had a detailed conversation whose main subject

was the place of the USSR and West Germany in world development and the role their relations play in the European and world politics.

Gorbachev started with saying that one should bear in mind what had happened between our two nations in order to draw lessons and look ahead to the future, even more so because it is getting ever more clear that a period of hostility and alienation is going down into the past. Ages-long ties between our peoples, between our cultures, are being gradually restored.

Lothar Spaeth's visit is part of an ever more active dialogue between the leaders, the public and the working people of the two countries. The understanding of a political significance of relations between the two countries is being formed in the process of the dialogue. Straightforwardness is a characteristic feature of the German nation, Gorbachev continued. This is why sluggishness and hesitation in West Germany in response to our proposals to deepen cooperation are especially noticeable.

A conclusion to the effect that our relations with West Germany should be different was drawn as a result of a serious consideration of the present-day role of West Germany, in line with a new thinking on which the whole of our European and world politics are based.

International relations cannot be dramatically changed and military-strategic notions of security cannot be removed from them without an independent contribution of Europe. It possesses the greatest historic experience, the biggest economic and intellectual potential. However, this role of Europe is unthinkable without West Germany and the improvement of its relations with the Soviet Union.

It is natural that our analysis is based on taking into account all the realities, including different social systems, the existence of military-political alliances and economic associations, bilateral obligations of states and so on. We are very scrupulous about Europe and are not going to put anybody in a difficult position. We want our policy to be predictable and clear to each and everyone.

We are also taking into account the fact that Western Europe is not ready so far to understand us the way we really are. People there continue to be afraid of the Soviet Union. This is deep-rooted. This affects the evaluation of the consequences for Europe of the INF Treaty, especially by those who stubbornly stick to the nuclear deterrence concept in relations with countries having the opposite system. This concept is brought about by certain interests which still get an upper hand over the realization of the fact that this approach will eventually lead to a disaster.

The attempts to undermine the INF Treaty with the help of 'compensation' can lead to a very grave political mistake. In this connection a realistic and active stand of

West Germany which is a non-nuclear power could play a positive and stabilizing part. This is in line with the interests both of West Germany itself and the whole of Europe, the whole world.

We are sure that the West will change its attitude towards the Soviet Union. Objective processes are working in this direction. On our part, we shall work for convincing the governments and nations that our peace policy is serious, principled, oriented towards a long perspective and is based on the principles of the balance of interests and the understanding of the fact that we all depend on each other in the present-day world.

Gorbachev and Spaeth pointed out the similarity or identity of their views of a number of key disarmament problems, such as the ratification of the INF Treaty, the reduction of strategic offensive armaments, the observance of the ABM Treaty, the banning of the chemical weapons, the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces. In this connection, Gorbachev continued, it would be in line with the interests of both countries and the whole of Europe to resolve as soon as possible the problem of a mandate for the Vienna conference and to start the negotiating process. This would remove the sources of concern. Instead of it we see that fears over some non-existent intentions of the USSR to get the upper hand over somebody in conditions of the reduction of nuclear weapons are again being kindled.

Gorbachev and Spaeth were in full agreement in their assessment of a principled importance of international economic relations in the present-day situation. In this connection they pointed out the indispensability of the original contribution made by Europe. However, a militaristic accent in the integration processes can seriously hamper it and distort its meaning.

Gorbachev welcomed a realistic and businesslike approach of Lothar Spaeth to the development of bilateral economic relations which is characterized by broad perspective, orientation to the up-to-date level of science and technology, the intention to use new original forms and to restore traditions of good neighbourly cooperation between our two nations.

West German businessmen are coming to realize the potentialities existing in the development of relations with the Soviet Union which has embarked on a path of profound economic transformations, and are drawing appropriate conclusions. Although one should not underestimate the importance of politics which can spoil everything, the creation of a stable structure of long-term economic and cultural relations is undoubtedly introducing elements of irreversibility to the relations between the two countries, to say nothing of direct mutual benefit, Gorbachev continued. He expressed high appreciation of the practical ideas and proposals with which Spaeth had come to the USSR and which he and the businessmen accompanying him intended to thoroughly analyze with their Soviet colleagues.

If we really opt for cooperation and even rapprochement, it is very important to be careful with the emerging positive processes. One should take into consideration, Gorbachev continued, that both your and our societies are very touchy about all that is connected with rather complicated relations between our two countries and nations. One should always bear it in mind.

As a result of the talks and taking into account a profound, meaningful and open nature of a dialogue going on of late between the two countries, Gorbachev and Spaeth stated that, judging by numerous indications, the Soviet-West Germany relations had started to move to a new higher level. We have made our choice, Gorbachev said. If the stand of the West German leadership is the same, the time has come to start thorough preparations for consolidating joint resolve and record it in documents at the coming summit.

Spaeth conveyed to Gorbachev the regards of West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl.

Gorbachev asked him to give his best regards to the chancellor.

The conversation was attended by Vladimir Kamentsev and Ambassador Andreas Meyer-Landrut.

Before the conversation was started the guests demonstrated a teaching robot created as a result of cooperation of Soviet industrial enterprises with Baden-Wuerttemberg firms.

Recounts Gorbachev Meeting

*LD100920 Moscow TASS in English 0846 GMT
10 Feb 88*

[Text] Moscow February 10 TASS—The lucidity with which Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, explained to me how important constructive relations with the Federal Republic are to the Soviet Union, impressed me greatly, a press-conference was told here today by Lothar Spaeth, minister-president of Baden-Wuerttemberg Land (FRG), CDU vice-chairman. On Tuesday Lothar Spaeth, who is currently on a visit in the USSR at the invitation of the government of the Russian Federation, was received by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Touching upon the meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev, Lothar Spaeth stressed that a highly intensive exchange of views had been held on a broad range of issues pertaining both to the international situation and bilateral relations, above all in the economic field.

We agreed that it is necessary to open a new chapter in the relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic, and fill them with specific content. Lothar Spaeth pointed to the favourable prospect of such a form of cooperation as the setting up of joint ventures and noted that five out of the seven such enterprises with the

participation of Western firms in operation in the USSR now had been set up with the participation of West German firms and companies, all of them being from Baden-Wuerttemberg.

The conversations with Soviet statesmen, the minister-president of Baden-Wuerttemberg said, covered questions pertaining to cooperation in the training of highly-skilled specialists. To that end it has been proposed to set up a joint working group to sound out the potentialities of such cooperation.

Meets With Kamentsev

*LD091722 Moscow TASS in English 1544 GMT
9 Feb 88*

[Text] Moscow February 9 TASS—Vladimir Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers, met today with Minister-President of Baden-Wuerttemberg Land Lothar Spaeth and representatives of the business circles who came to Moscow together with him.

There was a businesslike exchange of opinions on matters of Soviet-West German Economic, scientific and technological ties, specifically ties between Soviet amalgamations and enterprises and firms and organizations of Baden-Wuerttemberg. The sides confirmed their interest in the further development of these ties. Special emphasis was placed on new forms of economic cooperation, such as cooperation in production and setting up of joint ventures.

Meets With Tolstykh

*LD091958 Moscow TASS in English 1948 GMT
9 Feb 88*

[Text] Moscow February 9 TASS—Boris Tolstykh, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, chairman of the state committee for science and technology, today received Lothar Spaeth.

They discussed questions of further expanding and deepening cooperation between the USSR and the FRG in the field of science and technology.

The FRG Ambassador Andreas Meyer-Landrut was present at the conversation.

Possible Summit Discussed

*LD101109 Hamburg DPA in German 1015 GMT
10 Feb 88*

[Excerpts] Moscow, (DPA)—According to Kremlin chief Mikhail Gorbachev, a German-Soviet summit should be thoroughly prepared and connected with documents on the current state of mutual relations. [passage omitted]

Lothar Spaeth said today at an international press conference in Moscow that it is his impression that Gorbachev starts from the assumption that "after a series of mutual contacts and visits" these talks "should be concluded with an intensively prepared meeting" with Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl. In addition, "a series of possible intentions" should be "prepared and documented accordingly," Spaeth said. He too considers this right.

It can thereby be made apparent that there is not only a "new phase of detente" and a "search for better cooperation", but also that this "is not directed against anyone". Spaeth said he was "very impressed by the clarity" with which the Kremlin chief had articulated his interest in expanding German-Soviet relations. [passage omitted]

Spaeth, who is accompanied by a large economic delegation, intends to fly to Leningrad today where there are Soviet-Baden-Wuerttemberg joint ventures. His return to Stuttgart is scheduled for tomorrow afternoon.

Economic Ties Reviewed

*LD101114 Moscow TASS in English 1055 GMT
10 Feb 88*

[Text] Moscow February 10 TASS—Relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union should not be limited to the political field and it is necessary to expand economic and scientific interaction, contacts in the sphere of education and training of personnel, it was stated by Lothar Spaeth, minister-president of the West German Land of Baden-Wuerttemberg, deputy chairman of the Christian Democratic Union. He spoke at a press conference here today devoted to the results of his visit to the USSR.

Concrete results in the field of disarmament open up new prospects for expanding economic and cultural exchanges between the East and the West, he said further. In turn, the development of business and humanitarian contacts, including between the USSR and the FRG, can make a contribution to the solution of political problems and facilitate the creation of an atmosphere of trust and stability in Europe.

Among Western countries West Germany is the USSR's biggest partner and among all of the FRG's lands Baden-Wuerttemberg has the biggest machine-building potential, Lothar Spaeth said further. Machine-building is a priority field in the restructuring now in progress in the USSR and for this reason much attention to developing ties in this field was devoted at the talks with the Soviet leadership.

The possibility of setting up joint enterprises on Soviet territory is evoking a big interest both in the FRG and the USSR. Although unsolved questions remain in this field the business circles of Baden-Wuerttemberg are optimistic about the prospects of developing this form of

cooperation, the minister-president said. It is important that the first joint ventures are already operating and both sides are interested in their success.

There are quite a few problems in the development of business cooperation between the FRG and the USSR, Lothar Spaeth said. These include the small share of finished products in Soviet exports and currency problems. Much attention at the talks in Moscow was given to restrictions in the field of the transfer of high technology. I think that the Western countries, while not forgetting about security interests, should give thought to ways of making the Cocom restrictive lists shorter, he said.

AFP Roundup of Visit

AU101006 Paris AFP in English 0954 GMT
10 Feb 88

[Anne Penketh report]

[Text] Moscow, Feb 10 (AFP)—The Soviet Union and West Germany have agreed to a "whole range of contacts and visits" to prepare for a summit meeting between Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and Chancellor Helmut Kohl, a West German official said here Wednesday.

The further negotiations would identify "what we are able to sign at the summit," the premier of the West German state of Baden-Wuerttemberg, Lothar Spaeth, told a news conference here. He said Mr. Gorbachev's insistence that documents must be signed at the summit was correct.

"It is essential to prepare very carefully for this meeting, so as not to reduce it to simply talks, but have the signing of specific documents. I believe that this is quite correct," Mr. Spaeth said.

According to a TASS report of Mr. Gorbachev's two-and-a-half hour meeting with Mr. Spaeth on Tuesday, Mr. Gorbachev said the "time has come to start thorough preparations for consolidating joint resolve and record it in documents at the coming summit".

Mr. Spaeth, who is also deputy chairman of Mr. Kohl's Christian Democratic Union (CDU), mentioned technical and environmental fields as providing "the basis for future agreements", but did not say whether these would be signed at the summit, whose date has still to be fixed.

Asked about the extent to which the Cocom list—restricting the export of Western technology to the Soviet Union—hindered bilateral trade, Mr. Spaeth noted that the list had been trimmed at a Paris meeting last month.

He added that he had "certain doubts about the need for such an extensive Cocom list", but said that Soviet-West German cooperation would "not be obstructed by such lists".

He also said that a memorandum had been signed with Soviet authorities during his visit concerning the setting up of a working group to examine professional training of Soviet managers, in order to overcome problems faced by companies setting up joint ventures.

Noting that Baden-Wuerttemberg was party to five out of the seven joint ventures signed between Soviet and Western firms, Mr. Spaeth said a "juridical framework" for joint ventures was needed. Other problems to be settled remained the currency exchange situation and dual taxation.

But he said he was optimistic that "in the nearest future we will be able to resolve all the problems and let out joint output enter the world market."

An article in the weekly LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Wednesday described Mr. Spaeth—who faces regional elections next month—as the "godfather" of joint ventures.

Mr. Spaeth said he had been "greatly impressed" by Mr. Gorbachev's statement concerning the need for "positive and constructive relations" between the two countries. "I can assure him that the government and political forces of West Germany support this intensification, and long for it," he said.

Relations between West Germany and the Soviet Union have steadily improved since a visit here last July by President Richard von Weizsaecker, coming in the wake of Chancellor Kohl's remarks comparing Mr. Gorbachev to Hitler's propaganda chief Josef Goebbels, and the Mathias Rust landing in a light plane in Red Square.

Bonn and Moscow have agreed on the need for a summit, but the first six months of this year have been ruled out because of the tight schedules of both the West German and Soviet leaders.

Mr. Kohl and Mr. Gorbachev exchanged "best regards" through Mr. Spaeth, according to TASS.

The West German official arrived here Monday, at the invitation of the Russian Federation's Council of Ministers, on a five-day visit. He is accompanied by a delegation of 55 businessmen.

FRG Firm To Convert SS-20 Launchers

LD101114 Hamburg DPA in German 0926 GMT
10 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow, (DPA)—The Baden-Wuerttemberg machine-building firm Liebherr (Ehingen near Ulm) will convert the launchers for the Soviet SS-20 missiles after the coming into force of the INF Treaty between the

USSR and the United States, and build hydraulic construction cranes on the chassis, which is around 16 m long. A relevant agreement was signed in Moscow during the visit by the prime minister of Baden-Wuerttemberg, Lothar Spaeth.

At first Liebherr will convert two chassis that previously carried intermediate-range missiles, a spokesman for the state chancellery announced today in Moscow. The aim is a "long series." The USSR has more than 400 SS-20 missiles. According to the Stuttgart state chancellery, the head of sales at Liebherr, Friedrich Baer, signed the agreement, negotiated by Spaeth, yesterday evening.

Liebherr, itself a specialist for construction machinery and cranes, will carry out the order, which will not come into force until the ratification of the INF Treaty, together with the Soviet crane building firm "January Uprising Heavy Crane Construction Production Association." Liebherr already has a joint-venture contract with the firm on the Black Sea.

Commission on Waldheim's War Record Concludes
LD091733 Moscow TASS in English 1530 GMT
9 Feb 88

[Text] Vienna February 9 TASS—The international commission of historians to study "the war-time record" of Austria's Federal President Kurt Waldheim has come to an end in Austria's capital. The commission was formed on the president's insistence in connection with reports, which appeared in Western, above all American, mass media, last year, on his involvement in the Nazi Wehrmacht's crimes in the years of the Second World War. The American immigration service went as far as putting the name of Kurt Waldheim on the list of persons undesirable in the United States.

For a few months historians from a number of Western countries thoroughly studied the archive materials dating back to the war time period. On Monday, the commission's report with a total volume of about 200 pages was handed over to Austria's Chancellor Franz Vranitzky and Vice-Chancellor, Foreign Minister Alois Mock.

The content of report has not yet been made public. But, as was stated in a Radio Austria interview by the commission chairman, Swiss war historian Hans Kurz, the main conclusion is that Waldheim is not a war criminal.

A press conference was held on the results of the commission's work. Speaking at the press conference were Austria's Chancellor Franz Vranitzky and Foreign Minister Alois Mock. Answering journalists' questions Franz Vranitzky said that he had not yet looked through the

document but he conversed with the commission members who told him about the course and the results of the work. The information available, he underlined, does not contain data on Waldheim's "concrete and direct" involvement in war crimes.

The commission had a clear-cut mandate for its work: to establish whether Kurt Waldheim is a "war criminal" or not, and its reply to the question was unequivocally negative, Alois Mock said at the press conference. He criticised the work of some of its members who were trying to exceed the framework of their task of collecting and analyzing materials.

Speaking in Vienna, Kurt Waldheim expressed satisfaction with the results of the commission's work and underlined he was not going to step down.

Military-Political Situation in N. Europe Viewed
LD091758 Moscow International Service in Finnish
1700 GMT 7 Feb 88

[Text] [First announcer] Dear listeners: In the first military-political review of this year, we will see to what extent the north Europeans' hopes for peace have come true in January. Our correspondent, Commander Vladimir Kuzar, writes:

[Second announcer] As far as we see, two things have most affected the military-political situation in January in the north. Wide circles of citizens have dealt with the Soviet-U.S. agreement on abolishing intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, and the results of the visit to Norway and Sweden by Soviet premier Nikolay Ryzhkov. Both these things had the same purpose: to make the world a safer place and to make relations among peoples friendlier. In the Nordic countries, like everywhere else in the world, the intermediate- and shorter-range missile agreement has received support and approval. The whole nuclear weapon disarmament process, which started from the signing of this agreement, will lead to detente and to the strengthening of security in northern Europe.

The situation, in principle quite a new kind of situation that came about after the agreement, must be used in solving difficult international problems. This fact also was emphasized by Nikolay Ryzhkov during his visit to Scandinavia. He drew attention to the Soviet initiatives which Mikhail Gorbachev presented in his Murmansk speech on 1 October last year. The aim of those initiatives was to declare the northern areas of our globe and the Arctic to be peace areas and to fundamentally lower the level of military confrontation. All interested countries were urged to start negotiations to limit and reduce military activities in the north. First, the questions to be negotiated could be the founding of a nuclear weapon-free zone in northern Europe, the limiting of military activities in the marine areas limited by northern Europe, and the application of confidence-building measures.

The Nordic peoples' attention also was drawn to the proposal to start official negotiations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO on reducing military activities and limiting the scale of air force and naval activities in the Baltic Sea, the North Atlantic Ocean, the Norwegian Sea, and the Greenland Sea. As a whole, the Nordic countries have had a fairly positive attitude to the Murmansk initiatives. Nikolay Ryzhkov stated that the Soviet Union had noticed this and had proposed additional measures to continue the peaceful development.

The Soviet Union will invite Nordic observers to watch a Soviet naval exercise this year, without waiting for a solution to the question of confidence-building measures in the marine areas around Europe. The Nordic countries did not fail to notice the fact that the Soviet Union was prepared to include the Barents Sea in the areas of confidence-building measures. The Nordic countries also noticed the agreement to limit large naval and air force exercises in these areas to once every 2 years. It would also help to reduce military tension, if there were such areas in the northern and western parts of the Atlantic Ocean, where the activities of Soviet and U.S. antisubmarine forces and activities involving equipment of the military pacts would be banned.

To the same purpose, proposals also have been made to stop the concentration of navies in the international sounds and at the mouths of the sounds, and to define the entire number of vessels of these naval forces according to number, class, and other factors.

[First announcer] We are reporting Commander Vladimir Kuzar's military-political review for January. He writes:

[Second announcer] Nordic media often has stated that during Premier Ryzhkov's visit to Sweden and Norway, the Soviet Union again showed that it respected the interests of small countries. That is correct. The Soviet Union tries to build relationships with them in such a way as to make them feel equal to neighboring countries. Unfortunately, we must note that the stable condition and the line of the strengthening confidence, which also pleases the Nordic countries, is starting to run up against serious obstacles. A good example of this came in January. Opponents of this tendency are trying to sow distrust in Soviet policies and to create unease that the destruction of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles will have a detrimental effect on the world situation. In the shadow of such inventions, they try to increase their military preparations and to draw the Nordic countries into them. In the Nordic region, as in the whole of Europe, of particular danger are the NATO plans to replace the missiles due to be destroyed with other weapons. According to the NEW STATESMAN, U.S. General Galvins, Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe, is trying to get the U.S. Congress to approve funds to create a new nuclear arsenal in Europe. This would take into account the deployment by 1990 of

1,300 new cruise missiles and 380 seaborne cruise missiles, as well as an artillery battalion of short-range ballistic and cruise missiles in Western Europe. In that case, new U.S. warships and submarines with nuclear weapons will appear on the Norwegian and Danish coasts.

Nordic citizens also are worried that some 700 cruise missiles are to be placed in U.S. and British aircraft deployed in Britain by 1990. According to press reports, their power can be compared with the total power of the 160 land-based cruise missiles that will have to be removed from the Greenham Common and Molesworth bases. In other words, their tasks will be the same as those of the missiles being destroyed. As is known, their flight path was directed over Scandinavia.

Another fact about January: The NATO leadership decided to extend its sea and land exercises by joining up its northern flank. The representative of the Norwegian military command who disclosed this also observed that, in conjunction with this decision, the big NATO ("Teamwork") military exercises will occur every second year, not every fourth as hitherto. This is the way that NATO leaders reacted to the Soviet initiatives. Such a development of events is contrary to the attitude of Nordic citizens, anyway; like all other peoples, they want to live in conditions of peace and not as the hostages of others. That is why they call for active struggle to end military preparations and to continue the march toward nuclear disarmament. Swedish Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson has stated that the framework for disarmament should be extended and efforts should be made toward a treaty to reduce strategic and tactical weapons. The militarization of space must be prevented, and Nordic and other regions must be made into zones and corridors free of nuclear weapons. The strivings of the northern European peoples to reduce the level of military confrontation and to develop peaceful coexistence are the very factor that has characterized the military situation in northern Europe in January, concludes our correspondent, Commander Vladimir Kuzar.

Preliminary Results of Finnish Poll Analyzed
PM091623 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Feb 88
Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Kuznetsov report: "One Election Over, More To Come"]

[Text] Helsinki, 2 Feb—The results of the Finnish presidential elections show that the final decision on who will be president of Finland for the next 6 years will not be known until mid-February. In other words, the final round is still to come. True, few people here doubt that the voting in the electoral college will return President Mauno Koivisto. He won the support of almost one-half of the voters (47.9%) and far outstripped his rivals. However, he did not poll the 50% of the votes needed to be elected in the first round.

It should be noted that the fears of the current president's supporters about inertia among the voters were somewhat justified: Fewer than 83% of eligible Finns voted. This figure is smaller than at the previous presidential elections. The newspapers here today note that perhaps some Koivisto supporters "were so sure of his victory that they did not consider it necessary to vote."

On the whole, then, there is no doubting here the steady support of the voters for political parties on the left. After all, the candidates of the Social Democrats, the Finnish People's Democratic League, and the Communist Party together polled almost 60% of the votes.

Another fact is also noted: The outcome of the vote clearly indicates that most of the country's population definitely favor a continuation of Finland's political course, known as the "Paasikivi-Kekkonen line." It may be presumed, the Helsinki newspaper HUFVUDSTADSBLADET writes, that the majority of the electorate who voted for M. Koivisto did so in order to ensure continuity in the foreign policy sphere.

The number of votes cast for P. Vayrynen, the Center Party candidate, was a surprise for many people, including the large number of representatives of the foreign media present in Helsinki. Contrary to predictions, he defeated the National Coalition Party candidate and current Finnish Prime Minister H. Holkeri. They polled 20.1% and 18.1% of the votes respectively. The other candidates—K. Kivisto (representing Action-88, an organization supported by the Finnish Communist Party and the Finnish People's Democratic League) and J. Kajanoja (of the Democratic Alternative, which includes members of the Finnish Communist Party (Unity) polled 10.4% and 1.4% respectively.

It may be said, therefore, that the situation in Finland remains unchanged. The distribution of political forces suggests a continuation of the government's course, as President Koivisto himself stated after the election.

Foreign Trade Association Seeks Finnish Clients

PM091155 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Feb 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Shmyganovskiy article under the rubric "Facts, Events, Opinions": "'Tyazhmash' Looking For a Buyer"]

[Text] Helsinki—The Soviet foreign trade association "Tyazhmash," which has the right to trade independently on the world market, has acquainted Finnish business circles with its potential for the first time.

"Everyone realizes," V. Semin, general director of the association, said, "that it is very difficult to achieve balanced trade without extensively exporting Soviet machinery and equipment to Finland. But the Finnish market is still limited with regard to Soviet heavy machine building products. One solution is to use our

components in Finnish equipment supplied to third countries. There has been a lot of discussion and many assurances given in this respect, but very little real action has been taken so far...."

"Tyazhmash" supplies other countries with metallurgical equipment, rolling mills, railroad rolling stock, excavators, and other equipment. Five USSR Foreign Trade Ministry firms used to be responsible for dealing with the output of the Ministry of Heavy, Power, and Transport Machine Building, to which the association is attached. It has sometimes been the case that inquiries about equipment from clients here in Finland have not even received a reply. An overhead crane worth several million rubles needed by a particular businessman could not be fitted into the "global trade plan." So how could any confidence be generated?

"It is hard to say, of course, that the firm's appearance in Helsinki will immediately solve all our problems," Hannu Eskelinen, director-administrator of the Finnish-Soviet Chamber of Commerce, told me, "but it is still an event out of the ordinary. This is possibly the first time a Soviet firm has approached a potential client, rather than the other way around. That is how it should always be!"

Soviet-French Paris Symposium Held on Relations

PM091209 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Feb 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Paris, 8 Feb—A symposium has been held in Paris in which representatives of the USSR Academy of Sciences World Economics and International Relations Institute and the French Institute of International Relations took part. Over 2 days the participants discussed the importance of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, questions of Soviet-French relations, and regional conflicts.

Academician Ye.M. Primakov, head of the Soviet delegation, was received by Valery Giscard d'Estaing, chairman of the French National Assembly Foreign Affairs Commission and former president of the country; Jean Lecanuet, chairman of the French Senate Foreign Affairs Commission; and other officials.

Latin America & Caribbean

Noriega Demands Withdrawal of Southern Command

LD091520 Moscow TASS in English 0743 GMT 9 Feb 88

[Text] Panama City February 9 TASS—General Manuel Antonio Noriega, commander-in-chief of Panama's National Defence, has demanded that the U.S. South

Command withdraw from Panama. The South Command based on Panama spreads its activities to 19 Central and Latin American nations.

Speaking on television, General Manuel Antonio Noriega rejected the accusations made against him by the U.S. authorities of complicity in drug trafficking and declared full support for the demand of the Panamanian officers for the withdrawal from the country's territory of the headquarters of the U.S. South Command and the U.S. military bases. On Monday, representatives of the Army urged President Eric Arturo Delvalle of the Republic to close the U.S. bases in Panama's territory because of the "relentless political and economic aggression against Panama" by the United States. The military accuse the USA of interference in the Republic's home affairs and express their full support for General Noriega. In a resolution issued here the officers stress that the 14 U.S. bases in Panama should disappear. Their existence, the resolution says, meets only the interests of the U.S. military presence in the region and enables the USA to interfere in the home affairs of the countries friendly to Panama in violation of the treaty of neutrality of the Panama Canal Zone.

The Panamanian officers also demanded that General Ruben Dario Paredes and Colonel Roberto Gerera, who are responsible for the provocative campaign launched in the USA against General Noriega, be demoted. As is known, speaking in an interview with the U.S. CBS company, General Noriega accused the Reagan administration of a "political plot." He said then that the U.S. authorities had made against him provocative charges in particular of drug trafficking after his refusal to ensure support by Panama for an armed invasion of Nicaragua. General Noriega described as "false and ridiculous" such accusations spread in the USA. To prove his point he demonstrated letters of gratitude addressed to him by the senior officials of the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, the latest of which was dated February 1987.

Cuban Party Schools Sign Cooperation Agreement
PM091225 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Feb 88
Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Agreement Signed"]

[Text] Havana, 6 Feb—An agreement on cooperation in 1988-1989 between the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences and the Cuban Nico Lopez Higher Party School has been signed here. It was signed by R.G. Yanovskiy, rector of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, and Raul Valdes Vivo, rector of the Nico Lopez Higher Party School.

The cooperation between the Soviet and Cuban study centers is based on the traditions of friendship and fraternity which prevail between the USSR and the Republic of Cuba, on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist proletarian internationalism, and the

shared policy aims and interests of our fraternal parties, the document emphasizes. It is geared to the implementation of the tasks ensuing from the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 3d Communist Party of Cuba [PCC] Congress, the subsequent CPSU Central Committee and PCC Central Committee plenums, and other decisions and documents of our fraternal parties.

Under the agreement, the two higher educational establishments pledge to promote the effectiveness of cooperation through practical steps—by means of reciprocal exchanges of teaching and scientific cadres and the participation of Academy of Social Sciences and Cuban Higher Party School scientists in international conferences, symposia, seminars, and scientific-and-practical conferences organized by these establishments.

The sides have agreed to conduct a number of joint research projects, including projects on such topical themes as the study of the theoretical legacy of Ernesto Che Guevara, the outstanding Latin American revolutionary, and the implementation of his ideas in the process of socialist building in Cuba, and the enhancement of the standard of the working people's political education. An accord has been reached on the exchange of scientific literature.

During its stay in Cuba, the Soviet delegation acquainted itself with various aspects of the Cuban people's life and multifaceted activities. The guests paid a visit to the hero-city of Santiago de Cuba, the country's biggest metallurgical combine "Atillana de Acero" in Havana, and a mini-team of volunteer construction workers who are building cultural, social, and consumer amenities. They also had an opportunity to acquaint themselves with some aspects of the work of the Cuban Academy of Sciences.

Persisting Tensions in Argentina Viewed
PM091051 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
9 Feb 88 Second Edition p 3

[Yu. Sigov article under the rubric "We Respond to Readers' Request": "Putsch Thwarted—Tension Persists"; first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Excerpts] "I would like to read in KRSNAYA ZVEZDA's pages about the recent events in Argentina, about the underlying cause of the military revolt in that country—Guards' Senior Lieutenant S. Ivanov, Moscow Military District."

...On the morning of 18 January, government troops sent from Buenos Aires under the command of General Caridi attacked the rebels' positions in the small town of Monte Caseros, tucked away at the point where the borders of three countries—Uruguay, Brazil, and Argentina—meet. It was all over 3 hours later: Neither the hastily constructed fortifications nor the mining of streets and the bridge over the Uruguay River saved the

putschists. Nor were their hopes of a "people's uprising" realized. The Army remained loyal to the government and ended the revolt by decisive actions... [passage omitted]

Now that the tension created by the new attempt at a military revolt in Argentina is easing, it is possible to say with confidence that the chief reason for the failure of the putsch by Rico and his stooges was the determination of the civilian government and the Army to continue the process of democratization that began in the country on the accession of R. Alfonsin's cabinet to power. After the sentencing of those chiefly to blame for the crimes of the military junta which ruled the country from 1976 through 1982, the "former" people, displeased with the development of the democratization process, tried to cling desperately to their lost privileges. It should be said that the government itself also stimulated to some extent the activation of the right wing of the Army by withdrawing the prosecution of persons who committed crimes in the military junta's time "because the statute of limitation had expired." The Argentine leadership thereby not only gave rise to exultation in the camp of the "former" people but also caused certain disappointment among the broad people's masses, who could not forget their "missing" relatives and friends.

It is important to point out that this revolt by right-wing officers, even though on a lesser scale than last year's, could seriously influence the internal situation in the country. It is symbolic that under these conditions, the seven Argentine opposition parties, which are critical of the activities of R. Alfonsin's government on many issues, have come out in support of democratization and for the putschists' severe punishment. The Argentine press also described as "timely" the statement that General E. Crespo, chief of the Main Staff of the

country's Air Force, made 2 days after the revolt, to the effect that the Air Force will not permit a new military coup and will defend the constitutional system in the event of a real threat to it.

Thus, the situation in Argentina remains, as before, complex. Although the latest putsch by right-wing officers has failed, it has shown that there are still influential forces (above all in the Army) that oppose democratization of the country's political life. It is they, these forces, that are creating tension.

Chilean Communists Describe Upcoming Plebiscite
PY081736 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2130 GMT
6 Feb 88

[Text] If it is held amid a concerted struggle on all fronts against the regime, the plebiscite may provide a favorable opportunity for the people. The PCCh [Communist Party of Chile] asserted this in a statement released in Santiago and distributed through international press agencies. In its statement, the PCCh denounces the fraud being prepared by Pinochet's dictatorial regime, pointing out that fraud lies not only in the total control of the electoral system but, worse than that, is aided by the continuous practice of terror, repression, crimes, and kidnappings.

The no vote in the plebiscite, which has been arranged by 13 opposition parties, encourages dangerous wishful thinking about a deceitful electoral scenario, the communiqué states, adding that the participation of leftist parties in that arrangement is to be deplored. The Communists, the communiqué reiterates, believe that a decided struggle against the regime can turn the plebiscite, whatever its result, into the fuse to touch off a popular uprising leading to the downfall of the tyranny.

Political & Social

PRAVDA Describes Gromyko Visit to Belorussia

Tours Minsk

PM091433 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Feb 88
Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Soviets: Initiative and Businesslike Efficiency"]

[Text] Minsk, 1 Feb—Success comes to those local soviet ispolkoms and those deputies who organically link their activity with the voters, live for their concerns and needs, and constantly consult with people. A.A. Gromyko pointed this out in conversation with Krupitsa Village Soviet deputies, Minskiy Rayon. He began a working trip to Belorussia today by familiarizing himself with the life of rural working people.

On the "Novyy Byt" Kolkhoz A.A. Gromyko visited the dairy marketing unit, the central settlement, the trade center, and the kindergarten. Last year the farm's working people gathered in an average of almost 58 quintals of grain crops and 262 quintals of potatoes [per hectare] and produced 1,347 quintals of milk and 222 quintals of meat per 100 hectares of agricultural land. Not bad indicators, although the farm is not among the three best in the rayon.

It was pointed out that these achievements result from the concern of the kolkhoz party organization and leadership and the village soviet ispolkom to create good conditions for rural working people to work and rest.

The problems facing the farm were discussed in the conversation: raising profitability, increasing yields per hectare, improving productivity in livestock raising. There was also discussion of how the struggle is being waged against alcoholism and moonshining. Although drunkenness has declined on the village soviet's territory and, as a result, there has been an appreciable reduction in the number of offenses, deputies must not relax their attention to these negative phenomena, A.A. Gromyko pointed out. As a rule, you people in the countryside know the "masters of the spiral apparatus" and, having raised the public against them, it is necessary to eradicate moonshining in the very near future. Those present at the meeting remarked that Central Television did a disservice to all who campaign for sobriety by showing in one of its broadcasts the refinement of "skilled craftsmen" who have mastered a new technique for producing moonshine.

A.A. Gromyko emphasized that the party policy of democratization and of asserting genuine people's power immeasurably enhances the role and responsibility of the soviets in resolving the economic and social problems of their territories' development. Village soviets must make wider use of the rights afforded them and display greater initiative and businesslike efficiency.

There was a principled and exacting discussion of the personal responsibility of every elected representative of the people for the fate of restructuring and of persistence in fulfilling his own decisions.

A.A. Gromyko visited the "Granat" Production Association, which specializes in developing, manufacturing, and introducing in enterprises robot technology and comprehensive production automation equipment. In conversations with workers and specialists he inquired about problems of raising the technical standard of the output being produced and remarked that Minsk robots and complexes are still inferior to the best foreign analogues in terms of the most important characteristics. Their price remains high. Under conditions of the transition to economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing this could adversely affect the efficiency of their introduction into production. Attention was drawn to the need to more actively involve scientists of academic institutes and VUZ's in developing promising models and to set up temporary creative groups jointly with specialists. It is necessary to expand collaboration and technical ties with Soviet and foreign partners, A.A. Gromyko said. Your experience of business cooperation with kindred enterprises in socialist countries and with Finnish firms militates in favor of such a pooling of efforts. During a visit to the robot engineering complexes adjustment shop talks were held with workers who are, as a rule, specialists with higher education. When asked whether there are any difficulties in the production process, the workers replied that subcontractor enterprises frequently undersupply subassemblies, and their own shops sometimes work unrhythmically.

Flowers were laid at the memorial to V.I. Lenin.

Participating in the tour of Minsk and the oblast with A.A. Gromyko were Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; G.S. Tarazevich, chairman of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; and M.V. Kovalev, chairman of the republic Council of Ministers.

Addresses Supreme Soviet

PM091721 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Feb 88
Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Building Relations Among Soviets and Enterprises on New Principles"]

[Excerpts] Minsk, 2 Feb—The following alarming letter from pensioners of Yakimovich, a village "without a future," arrived just before the session of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet began. "...Since last April the store has been shut and the bus service has been poor, yet we have organized a kolkhoz and put in a lot of work. Now even the children are not always able to come and help and bring medicine and goods." Let us add to these

bitter words voiced by veterans of kolkhoz construction the fact that people in the village, which is 10 km from the rayon center, have to go 7 km to school and 15 km to the rural soviet.

Perhaps this is a rare or exceptional case? But no, it is not, acknowledged G.S. Tarazevich, chairman of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, who today delivered a report to the session which examined the tasks of the republic soviets in speeding up the solution of the Food Program and ensuring the social reorganization of the countryside. A.A. Gromyko participated in the session's work.

There are still a good many such villages, the main speaker went on. Callous, indifferent leaders of ispolkoms, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes who neglect their duty to war and labor veterans must be made most strictly accountable. The latter's living and social conditions must be constantly monitored by deputies.

But how are things with the people who will soon be replacing those taking well-deserved retirement? Perhaps the picture there is different? Far from it. Three-fourths of young men and women from the country prefer to study and work in cities.

Schools, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes, the speaker noted, provide virtually no vocational guidance to young men and women. Often graduates of vocational and technical colleges are not used in their speciality, are provided with defective equipment, and are rarely given assistance in setting up a home of their own. Last year all the republic's oblasts, save Vitebsk, failed to meet their target for the utilization of state capital investments earmarked for the construction of general education schools. Yet three-fourths of 8-year schools are without central heating, mains water, or sewerage. [passage omitted]

The session was addressed by A.A. Gromyko. We are meeting at the beginning of 1988, he said, a year which is continuing the historic decisions of party and state. The country quite recently marked the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The party Central Committee plenums in January and June last year developed the theory and policy of restructuring and renewing our society. The Law on the State Enterprise, which enshrines the basic principles and thrusts of the revolutionary transformations in the national economy, came into force 1 January. We thus have an integrated concept of restructuring.

Democratic processes are deepening in the life of society. Social thinking is becoming bolder and weightier and a situation of openness and glasnost is being established. An atmosphere of honest competition for minds and talents, for the pursuit of an effective cadre policy and for combating bureaucracy and official abuse is being

created. People have begun to regard work differently and criticism, self-criticism, the elective principle, and responsibility are asserting themselves.

We have grounds for saying with confidence that people's belief in the irreversibility of the changes is growing stronger. Socialism, M.S. Gorbachev stresses, is gathering momentum and is more fully showing its potential through the people's political and social activeness.

Restructuring is making an ever-increasing impact on socioeconomic development. The economic year ended with quite good results in industry, capital construction, agriculture, and transport. The country is carrying out major programs in health care, science, culture, the services sphere, and housing construction.

Qualitative changes have also occurred in the Belorussian national economy. Almost all industrial output growth—which is quite considerable compared with other republics—has been achieved through enhanced labor productivity, which is particularly significant. Restructuring of the economic system is advancing on a broad front. It is gratifying that the intensification of production is being based on scientific and technical progress.

Soviet Belorussia today is a region of major machine and machine tool building, chemical, petrochemical, electronics, and instrument making industries. Many consumer goods deserve praise. Splendid cadres of workers, specialists, and scientific workers have developed.

However, Belorussia is still producing quite a few goods which do not stand up to comparison with the best. Around 100 types of goods which can and should be produced locally continue to be imported.

The establishment of new economic methods is still meeting with quite a few difficulties. Imbalances between production targets and material and technical backup, unjustified economic normatives, and gaps in the price-fixing system are not infrequent.

The republic's agro-industrial complex has great potential. Much has been done to mechanize work on kolkhozes and sovkhozes, reclaim land, increase soil fertility, and develop stockraising. Last year an average of 33.9 quintals of grain per hectare were harvested for the first time. Cereal, sugar beet, milk, and egg output has exceeded the target set for 1990, and meat production is on target. The return from the subsidiary plots of enterprises and organizations is growing, and collective horticulture and truck farming are showing dynamic development. The republic's inhabitants are really experiencing the fruits of the party's new agrarian policy.

However, the range of fruit and vegetables remains narrow. Targets for the production and procurement of cucumbers, tomatoes, and green vegetables are not being met. There is not enough processing capacity for potatoes and sugar beets.

The question of social transformations is an important and in many respects urgent one. Our social policy is directly bound up with people and is designed to enhance the people's material and spiritual standards. Everything is important here—housing, healthcare, trade, consumer services, schools, and culture centers. This determines to quite an extent the atmosphere and moral climate at the workplace and in the family.

Much housing is being built in Belorussia now. Rural population centers are being comprehensively reorganized. Many of them please by their sensible planning, architectural invention, colorful finishes, and abundance of greenery. I saw this for myself yesterday when I visited Minsk Oblast's "Novyy Byt" Kolkhoz. Yet local soviets are still not fully exercising the right to pool the resources of various departments for housing construction. The own-resources method is not yet receiving due application. It is still very difficult for someone building his own home to obtain certain construction materials.

There is also a serious backlog in the provision of services to the population. The republic has been set the task this year of completing the organization of rayon-based intersectorial combines providing municipal services to the rural population. Soviets must seek to secure real advances in solving rural inhabitants' pressing consumer problems.

Good and bad levels of service and the ability to adopt a state-minded approach to the sale of what is produced in the field or on the factory floor and to the provision of sufficient goods for working people to spend their wages on are to be seen at the store counter and workshop customer-order desk. The year during which the Belorussian state trade service operated under the new economic conditions showed that, placed in an equal position with other republics, it met its 1987 target. The target for commodity turnover in public catering was somewhat exceeded.

Consumer trade cooperatives are lagging behind the republic's state trade service in many respects. The matter could be considerably improved through citizens' individual labor activity and the creation of various cooperatives. But this reserve is clearly underused. Soviets must work hard to increase the influx of pensioners and housewives into cooperative activity, give them real assistance, determine the real needs of every region, and pursue a sensible policy in the sphere of pricing goods.

The realities of our era are such that intensive economic activity puts a strain on the environment. Our attitude to nature is an important indicator of our respect for one another and our descendants. This is no exaggeration. Damage to the environment cannot be explained away as "production necessity."

We have pretty strong environmental protection laws in force. However, you get the impression that not all leaders or economic managers show due concern to ensure that they are observed. The campaign for a clean environment at the work place is being relegated to the sidelines, as it were. A ramified public health service network, the prosecutor's office, internal affairs organs, trade unions, and soviet environmental protection commissions are in existence. But flagrant breaches of production procedures and harmful discharges are taking place right before their eyes.

In accordance with the "Basic guidelines for the development of the protection of the population's health and the restructuring of health care in the USSR in the 12th 5-Year Plan and the period to 2000," measures are being implemented in the republic to further improve the population's medical service and the material and technical base of medical institutions. However, the Ministry of Health and the soviets must make greater efforts to fulfill what has been planned. The capital allocated for investment in the construction of health care facilities is not always fully used. The shortage of cadres and on occasions their low level of skill prevent full use being made of medical establishments. The republic's sanatorium and spa facilities are clearly inadequate.

I doubt if you would find a single family which has not been afflicted by illness. One of the worst enemies of good health is drunkenness. In the most literal sense it destroys the individual.

Much is being done in the campaign against drunkenness in the republic. But to date these efforts remain largely at an administrative level. The problem of home alcohol production remains acute. More work is needed from the public and deputies. It is necessary to work in the economy, culture, ideology, and the organization of sensible leisure to ensure that everyone sees the full richness of life and does not look at it through an alcoholic haze. The edifice of an advanced society such as mankind's best minds and the great founders of communist teaching have dreamed about must be built by people who are thoroughly developed and who lead healthy and intelligent lives.

There are still many shortcomings in the struggle against crime, too. A considerable number of crimes are committed through drunkenness. Theft, waste, and shortages remain high.

The strengthening of legality and law and order will be helped by the further improvement of criminal law and the implementation of the judicial and legal reform which is currently the subject of vigorous work by central party and state organs. The main thrust of the documents in preparation is the further democratization and consistent implementation of the principles of social justice. It will be a question in particular of more

rigorous determination of degrees of criminal responsibility, the greater use of noncustodial sentences, and the enhancement of the role of labor collectives, social organizations, and social self-help organs in reeducating offenders.

Democracy and glasnost require a determined intensification of the struggle at local level to safeguard legality, law and order, and labor and civic discipline. However, one still finds instances of a bureaucratic attitude on the part of officials toward people's legitimate requests and of the infringement of citizens' rights. Unlawful dismissals are frequent. Violations within the law enforcement organs themselves have still not been fully eradicated.

Soviets have an important role to play in resolving the existing problems and implementing the party's strategic course, A.A. Gromyko stressed. Soviets' responsible tasks and great powers at the present stage were determined in the well-known CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers resolution of 25 July 1986.

The soviets' concern today is the implementation on their territory of the state's socioeconomic policy and the ensuring of effective economic leadership. Soviets can and must adopt a completely new approach to the resolution of questions connected with the population's municipal, consumer, and trade services, the construction of social, cultural, and consumer facilities, and with everything affecting people's working and everyday living conditions. This in turn means it is necessary to reveal more fully the democratic potential inherent in the organs of soviet power.

Many local soviets now hold prior discussions of draft decisions in labor collectives and in local neighborhoods. This is having a beneficial effect on increasing the activeness of deputies and the population alike. Most important is that people feel a direct involvement in the affairs of their soviet. Their opinion is taken into account and this increases the interest in implementing the soviet's decisions.

The activation of this work will be given a further boost by the republic law on people's discussions which has been submitted for examination by the present session of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet. The discussion not only of questions of local significance but also of all important questions pertaining to the republic's state and social life is to be the permanent norm. Appreciable work is also being done to restructure the activity of people's deputies. More than one-half of the deputies were replaced in the republic during the elections held last June and resourceful creative people were elected to local organs of power.

Soviets now need to build their reciprocal relations with all enterprises on new principles and in the light of the Law on the State Enterprise. The arbitrary allocation of various additional targets, a practice to which soviet

ispolkoms have often resorted in the past, is incompatible with economic accountability. It is necessary to instill in soviet workers and ispolkoms a fundamentally new management ethic and democratic relations with the leaders of production units and with labor collectives. Of course, both sides must have the ability to combine interests.

Party committees throughout the country are now conducting reports on the management of restructuring. Their plenums are examining the activity of Communists working in the soviet apparatus, too. There is nothing surprising in this approach; it is for the good of the cause.

What specifically is being discussed? First, in the initial stage of restructuring local soviets and their ispolkoms slackened the pace, failed to show initiative in the spirit of the times, failed to launch extensive work to improve their style and methods, or to combat bureaucracy and formalism in their work. Second, quite a few soviet workers have failed to evaluate their own activity soberly or draw lessons from criticism. They even delay their fulfillment of decisions in the expectation of additional directives from above. Third, the mechanism of excessive administration, the use of pressure in work with labor collectives and deputies—in brief, the command and bureaucratic methods condemned by the party—still operate in a number of places.

The new approaches to the fuller use of the soviets' potential must be sought among the people all the time. It is the direct duty of deputies as spokesmen for the people's interests in their soviet to accumulate the experience of the masses and the initiative and innovativeness of pacemakers.

Party organs play an important role in this work. They must not assume the functions of soviets as they have done before and unfortunately to a large extent still do today. Substitution of that kind is of no benefit either to soviet or party organs. The result often is merely to lower the standard of the political leadership which party organs have to exercise. Yet it is the enhancement of party organizations' vanguard role which to a large extent is the guarantee of the success of our economic reform, the democratization and broad glasnost of socio-political life, and the renewal of all aspects of socialist society.

Soviets have still not learned how to make full use of their extensive rights and potential. The age-old timidity and circumspection with which soviets act even when they have the final word are making themselves felt. Unfortunately it cannot be said yet that soviets everywhere are equal to all the tasks facing them.

The most important result in international life in 1987 was M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Washington and the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, which, for the

first time in history, sets in motion the reduction of the nuclear arsenals. The USSR invariably pursues a policy of strengthening friendship and cooperation with the socialist countries, and in its relations with them mutual study and the use of the experience of socialist building are acquiring ever greater significance. Important decisions have been taken by CEMA aimed at advancing integration and the phased harmonization of the fraternal countries' economies.

In conclusion, A.A. Gromyko expressed the confidence that as Belorussia's working people move toward the 19th all-union party conference they will achieve new successes in the struggle for the great cause of the revolutionary renewal of our society.

Gromyko Addresses Lithuanian Soviet Workers

*PM091405 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Feb 88
Second Edition p 2*

[TASS report: "Soviets Must Hold Key Positions in Restructuring"]

[Text] Vilnius, 5 Feb—Having learned to count every kopek, the economically accountable [khozraschetnyy] teams on Lithuanian kolkhozes have run up against an obvious paradox. The prices for their products remain stable and low, while the prices of equipment, construction materials, and services are growing uncontrollably.

The frank and businesslike discussion which took place in Vilnius today at a conference of leading workers of soviet organs with the participation of the republic's party and economic aktiv also highlighted other problems. These result from the people's vital interest in renewing all aspects of our life. For example, local soviet elections in Kaunasskiy Rayon have been held in multi-seat okrugs. Their results produced a surprise. Some active, exacting, and principled candidates ended up among the reserve deputies. The experiment "posed" the question: Are reserve deputies needed? Might it not be expedient to deem elected the one who obtains at least 75 percent of the votes?

Thoroughness and concreteness distinguished the overwhelming majority of the speeches at the conference, in which A.A. Gromyko participated. It examined the progress in fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum decisions on the radical restructuring of economic management and in developing the social sphere in the republic and the tasks of further improving the work of soviet ispolkoms.

The keynote speaker—V.V. Sakalauskas, chairman of the republic Council of Ministers—did not focus attention on successes in Lithuania's economic and social development. He admitted that restructuring is being carried out only slowly in certain sectors of the national economy and has not embraced all labor collectives.

There are still many loss-making enterprises and economic organizations, the prime cost of individual products is high, and there are considerable losses resulting from slipshod work. The switch to two- and three-shift operation of progressive equipment is being made only slowly. These questions must be within the ispolkoms' field of vision. The effectiveness of their work largely depends on their ability to use their rights and on their awareness both of the broadening of their duties and of their growing responsibility for their work.

The need to better satisfy the population's requirements and needs puts the resolution of the Food Program in one of the first places. The insignificant influence of local soviet ispolkoms and rayon agro-industrial associations on improving the structure, style, and methods of work in sectors of the agro-industrial complex cannot be satisfactory.

S.L. Gorshanov, fitter at the F.E. Dzerzhinskiy Machine Tool Building Production Association and deputy of the Leninskiy Rayon Soviet in the city of Kaunas, self-critically assessed the activity of the association's deputies' group. Our enterprise management, he pointed out, adopted a pledge to render paid services to the working people, including repairs to apartments and the construction of individual houses. Unfortunately, the promise has not been fulfilled. We deputies are still in the role of observers and have not demanded that the management resolve this important question or helped it to do so.

Is it not too costly for a young family to have a house built in the countryside, when one costs more than R30,000, or even R50,000 if produced at the Alitus Housebuilding Combine?—A.-B.A. Mastauskene, chairman of Zapishkis Village [apilinkovyy] Soviet, asked the gathering. An economically strong farm, she continued, has the right to meet 50 percent of the cost of a house for its worker, but who will help a rural teacher or doctor? Is he not the equal of an agricultural specialist?

P.A. Galgatavichyus, chairman of Utenskiy Rayispolkom, also spoke of the housing problem. He touched on the question of making efficient use of the existing housing stock. Practice shows that elderly people continue living in three- and four-room apartments when their children obtain living space. More rational use could be made of their apartments.

Under conditions of democracy there cannot be inequitable business relations, M.A. Adamavichyus, chairman of the October Revolution Kolkhoz, believes. The shortage of spare parts still makes us fawn on "Selkhoztekhnika" and pay the bills for work both done and not carried out. We have preferred to break off contact with rayon chemical and construction workers, who do not suit us at all. Our kolkhoz machine operators and construction workers carry out these jobs better and more cheaply. For example, we saved R60,000 on just one cow barn, which we constructed using our own resources. Yet

the way out is not to shoulder all jobs in addition to agricultural ones. It is to balance the rights of partners and make their cooperation mutually advantageous, and much here depends on legislative organs.

A.A. Gromyko addressed the conference. It gives me great satisfaction, he said, to participate in this forum of the republic's party and soviet aktiv.

What is our discussion about today? The subject is simple and understandable. There is a need—and you yourselves feel this—to speak about certain problems facing the republic in all their magnitude.

The approach must be a party-minded one. The successes—let us call them successes. The shortcomings and perhaps even hitches in certain sectors of life in the republic, let us call them just that—shortcomings and hitches.

The purpose of our meeting is obvious—to find paths and approaches to improve the situation. In addition, it has long been known that it is possible to turn even something good into something still better. At such forums you usually expect—and I hope that you will understand me correctly—everyone to say what is the actual state of affairs and candidly share their thoughts. This is what I would like to see at your aktiv, and I think it is taking place in just this spirit.

People have gathered here who worthily head one of our union republics. I convey to you very best wishes that you confidently stand on watch, ensuring the cause of great restructuring in the republic's economic, social, and spiritual life. The entire country and the entire Soviet people are now living for this.

The process of restructuring is irreversible. There is and will be no deviation here. Its chief aims are well known to us—the achievement of accelerated, dynamic economic development, positive and decisive changes in the social sphere, and the deepening of democratization in all aspects of the life of society.

The republic is preparing to celebrate a great anniversary—the 70th anniversary of the formation of the Communist Party and the establishment of Soviet power in Lithuania in fighting 1918. The power of the soviets was reestablished by the Lithuanian people in 1940, and it is now stronger than ever. Perhaps there are lunatics somewhere abroad who do not understand this. Well, life will help to cure them.

Under socialist conditions, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev rightly pointed out during his stay in the Soviet Baltic republics, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have pooled their material and spiritual resources with the other union republics. They have been able to rely on the tremendous potential of our entire country's national economic complex. Thousands of threads of economic ties extend from Lithuanian soil to the remotest corners

of the union. Cotton, motor vehicles, tractors, coal, and oil come to you. Working Lithuania in turn sends precision machine tools, electric motors, instruments, consumer goods, and agricultural produce to very different destinations. This is a natural process under conditions of a socialist state.

Restructuring is making great strides across the country, millions of working people have actively joined in it, and it is part and parcel of every labor collective and every Soviet person. The party is mobilizing all the people's forces to fulfill the tasks at the present, decisive stage of restructuring, and the organs of people's power—the soviets—must hold the key positions here. I wish to dwell particularly on this question.

What is characteristic of the soviets' activity today? Of course, the process of activating and improving their work is taking place, their ability to work is growing, and their impact on all spheres of life is growing. This is noticeable. It cannot be denied. The soviets have every opportunity for this, in your republic too. There are experienced, skilled cadres and, most importantly, the population's active support. But justice requires us to admit that they have done far from everything that the party and the people demand. The soviets have not everywhere become genuine, solicitous masters, and their activity still accords far from fully with the demands of profound transformations in the life of society.

In carrying out the cardinal reform of the economy, it must be remembered that the unity of the regions' social and economic development, the unity of the interests of the labor collectives of enterprises and organizations located on the soviet's territory and of the inhabitants of villages, settlements, and cities is one of the chief principles toward which the party orients the people. Therefore, it is necessary to create the production and social structure and the organization of trade, public catering, health care, and consumer services which ensure high production indicators and, at the same time, favorable working and living conditions for people.

The first results of restructuring and of work under the new conditions which we see in the Lithuanian SSR, let us state frankly, are quite good. During the first 2 years of the 5-year plan the increase in the volume of industrial output stood at more than 10 percent, and 11 percent for agricultural output. Much has also been done to develop the social sphere. All this is the result of the labor and the skilled organizational work of party and soviet organs. You also have progressive workers working successfully under conditions of economic accountability and self-financing.

Why have positive results been achieved in individual collectives? The answer is clear—initiative, the use of progressive management methods, and, of course, attention to social, everyday questions or, to put it more simply, to the working person.

The latter is particularly important. Can a working person work most efficiently with a machine tool if he has bad housing, if his child is not in a kindergarten and is left unminded, if trade and consumer services are poorly developed? No, all this will naturally hinder work.

On the other hand, where will the money be found to construct housing, kindergartens, hospitals, schools, clubs, and stores if enterprises do not work efficiently? If a sufficient number of good-quality commodities that satisfy the population's needs do not appear on the store counters? If funds are not earned to develop the social sphere? We are only at the start of the road here, in this sphere.

The new thinking which is spreading increasingly widely among workers, kolkhoz members, specialists, and leaders of party and soviet organs leads to the conclusion that only the comprehensive development of the social and production spheres will make it possible to achieve high results.

The Law on the State Enterprise came into effect in January this year. It is designed to help increase production, opens up broad scope for showing initiative and healthy socialist enterprise, and extends the powers of labor collectives. But it is necessary to look the truth in the eyes: Difficulties have arisen in implementing the law, and more will emerge. Not everyone is ready to work under the new conditions. Let us look at output delivery plans—14 of your enterprises failed to fulfill them—27 enterprises failed to cope with the targets for increasing labor productivity, and 22 lagged behind in consumer goods production. It will not be easy for these plants and factories to work under conditions of self-capitalization, and workers and engineers could find themselves dissatisfied. Measures must be taken to rectify the situation, and without delay.

There are also successes in the republic in fulfilling the Food Program, the role of the soviets in this work has been strengthened, leadership of the agro-industrial complex has become more concrete, and there is greater interest in the end results of labor. Under unfavorable weather conditions last year you succeeded in growing and harvesting more than 32 quintals of grain crops per hectare. You obtained more meat, milk, and eggs. However, the tasks here are far from resolved, and there are no grounds for complacency. This concerns both your republic and the country as a whole.

The social thrust of restructuring is increasingly being stepped up. The average annual commissioning of housing in the country as a whole has increased 9 percent. The plans of the party and the state to provide every family with a separate apartment or house by the year 2000 are well known. It is no secret that this can be done only through great, strenuous labor. But it must be done. At least 10 million square meters of housing must be constructed in Lithuania alone during the 5-year plan. The volumes of housing construction really are growing,

but far from in the way necessary to fulfill the plans. Storm tactics are still used. Here is one of last year's indicators: One-third of the planned housing was commissioned during the last 6 weeks alone. It is also noteworthy that the pace of housing construction in the countryside has slowed down. Questions of housing must constantly be the focus of attention of soviets and all economic organizations.

The population is very concerned at the still low quality of consumer goods. The plans for their production are, in the main, being fulfilled, but you will not always find what is in demand. Many slow-moving and unmarketable goods have accumulated in warehouses. The imbalance between commodity resources and the development of retail commodity turnover and the growth of consumer potential remains one of your chief problems.

Lithuania has long been renowned for its crafts and skilled folk craftsmen. New opportunities have now emerged for developing individual labor activity and joining together in cooperatives, and the soviets must be a bit more active here. More than one-fourth of the registered cooperatives have still not begun working at all—they are not being given premises or being helped with raw materials and semimanufactures.

Now let us look at problems of nature conservation. A decision on the radical restructuring of nature conservation work was adopted quite recently. This is a very important sphere in the soviets' activity; they have not yet shown real concern for man's environment and people's health. The Baltic is being polluted, and purification installations, particularly in rural localities, do not work efficiently enough or are totally inoperative. Union ministries—above all the Ministries of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry, of the Production of Mineral Fertilizers, of the Electrical Equipment Industry, of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, and of the Construction Materials Industry—are being slow to construct nature conservation projects. The soviets and their organs must use all their rights and the strength of public opinion to rectify the situation as quickly as possible.

The republic has achieved considerable successes in protecting people's health. The plans for construction of medical establishments are being fulfilled, the overall sickness rate is dropping, disease prevention has been stepped up, and medical assistance for children is improving. The supply of medical workers is higher than the average for the country, and it seems that both party organs and soviets have worked well here.

The development of man's spiritual sphere is increasingly coming to the fore today. Much is being done in Lithuania in this sphere. The national culture has achieved a genuine flowering over the years of Soviet power. Thousands of theaters, museums, exhibition halls, and libraries have been constructed. Works by Lithuanian writers are being read in 36 languages of the

USSR's peoples and 28 foreign languages today. Your artists, musicians, and cinematographers are famous. The poet Eduardas Mezhelaytis is famed throughout the world. I am pleased to note the award of the USSR State Prize to a group of creative workers of Vilnius Youth Theater. The culture of Lithuania and its people did not know such recognition in the past.

Today we are focusing ever greater attention on the soviets' work efficiency. Efficiency based not on an increase in the number of sessions, questions examined, and paper covered with writing but on practical deeds.

What can be said today about the standard of the soviets' organizational work? Not all is well here. Overregimentation in holding soviet sessions has still not been overcome in the republic, as in the country as a whole; they are held in the old way, and there is too little initiative, criticism, and frequently also glasnost. It is possible to hear many complaints that the soviets' staff apparatus edits deputies' speeches, suggests the area on which they must speak, and rations criticism. This practice must, of course, be ended.

However, I would also like to draw your attention to another aspect. Let us state frankly that many deputies have still familiarized themselves badly with the situation which has taken shape in recent years. Certain deputies believe that prescribed speech outlines certainly exist. However, just one thing is required of them: to speak frankly and honestly about the difficulties, about the demands advanced by voters, and about the ways and means to fulfill them, and to utilize and develop glasnost.

Glasnost today is helping to expose serious violations of socialist legality. Despite the apparent trend toward a drop in crime in your republic, the soviets and their ispolkoms still have insufficient impact on the process of strengthening legality and safeguarding citizens' rights and interests. There has been an increase in the number of offenses by drunks and drug addicts. The people must know that the struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism is a struggle for people's health, not a temporary campaign but a constant state line.

The question of the role of ispolkoms, their work under the soviets' leadership, and their accountability and responsibility has been specially raised at our conference. Yet there are still many cases where ispolkoms supplant soviets and deputies. It even happens that it is not the ispolkom but the ispolkom apparatus that resolves corresponding questions. This is, of course, abnormal.

The cardinal transformations taking place in the Soviet Union nowadays, including in the Lithuanian republic, the growth in the Soviet state's international prestige—all this attracts the attention both of our friends and of our enemies. With what can we respond? Above all, with successes in developing the economy and resolving social

problems, with successes in the sphere of culture. We must ensure that every one of our people really feels the advantages of the socialist way of life. The whole atmosphere in society, in the family, and at school and literature and art must efficiently foster in the population, including in young people, a sense of Soviet patriotism. The friendship of the peoples is one of the chief mainstays of the Soviet state's unity and strength, and it is our sacred duty to cherish it as the asset of the whole people.

All our work is directed toward the cause of peace, toward strengthening international security. We in no way underestimate the difficulties and obstacles in the way of nuclear disarmament, of which there really are many. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's meetings with President R. Reagan and the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles convincingly prove the realism of our plans and the correctness of the chosen course. It is important now to develop the success achieved and to give a new boost to the process which has begun. It is a question both of halving the strategic arms of the United States and the USSR and of eliminating chemical weapons and reducing conventional arms and armed forces.

As you know, the 19th all-union party conference will be held this June to examine cardinal problems of the country's life and questions of the further democratization of Soviet society. The achievement of new high indicators in the development of the material and social spheres and the efficiency of restructuring must make a specific contribution to the preparations for this very important event.

Permit me to wish you all and the people of Soviet Lithuania the best results in resolving urgent questions of restructuring and the life of the fraternal republic!

A.A. Gromyko looked over Yustinishkes—a new city district of Vilnius. During a visit to a food store he chatted with customers and trade workers.

In the afternoon A.A. Gromyko met with members and candidate members of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau. He emphasized in the talks that the Soviet people now have and can have no policy other than the policy of restructuring. People must have confidence that we will fulfill all the substantiated and well calculated plans.

The role of the soviets and their broad rights, which are still far from fully utilized, were emphasized. The soviets are obliged to utilize their plans more boldly, more animatedly, and with greater responsibility, and all this must be done in the name of ensuring that the indicators of our successes are the maximum possible. Confidence was voiced that in many fields of the social sphere Soviet Lithuania can become one of the country's leading republics.

In the evening A.A. Gromyko left for Moscow.

Songayla Addresses Lithuanian Party Plenum
PM051403 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 88
Second Edition p 2

[Special correspondents N. Demidov and D. Shnyukas dispatch under the rubric "Party Life: Elective Organs' Reports": "Implementing the Renewal More Boldly"]

[Text] Vilnius—Lithuania's Communists and working people were looking forward with great interest to the Republic Communist Party Central Committee Plenum which gathered after the leadership of the republic party organization had been renewed.

It became obvious from the plenum speeches that changes for the better have occurred in the socioeconomic development of the republic. Nonetheless, the restructuring has been conducted with too much caution, the beneficial processes have come up against the inertia and undisguised wait-and-see attitude of many Communists. Meanwhile neighboring republics have begun to overtake or catch up with Lithuania. The republic's Communist Party Central Committee Bureau report to the plenum made it possible to subject the reasons for the prevailing situation to a profound analysis and to define ways to achieve acceleration.

Delivering the report, R. Songayla, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee noted that the bureau's style of work is now characterized by greater efficiency, that the work is more to the point and there is less fuss and stage-management. Fundamental questions are submitted for discussion by Central Committee members, the party aktiv, and the public at large. Nonetheless, in general there still is not enough dynamism, initiative, and self-criticism in organizational work. The main weak link is the execution and monitoring of adopted decisions. The bulk of paper that is descending from above sometimes threatens to bring work to a halt, plenum participants noted with alarm. P. Mikyalenis, first secretary of the Kaunasskiy party raykom reported: In 1986 we received around 100 resolutions from the republic's Communist Party Central Committee, 64 of which had to be followed up. Last year their number was even greater.

"Paperwork is detaining us in our offices, it is preventing us from paying visits to party organizations, from engaging in real work with the masses"—this was the conclusion reached by A. Chistyakov, secretary of the Vilnius Party Gorkom.

"Now, in conditions of restructuring it is particularly important to enhance the role of elective organs," A. Ivanov, electrical engineer at the "Metalistas" association said. "But what is happening in actual fact? So far over the past year, my role as member of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee has not changed in any way. Occasionally I speak at plenums and I sit on

one of the commissions. However, I am not satisfied with the return. Once I submitted a proposal, but I did not get an answer. In short, the Central Committee Bureau would be well advised to give some thought to how it could better utilize the potential of members of elective organs."

Secrecy and stage management go hand in hand. Obsolete approaches could even be glimpsed in the work of the plenum itself. The report referred to omissions on the part of Republic Communist Party Central Committee secretaries and Bureau members in very vague terms, for instance. "Central Committee Secretary N. Mitkin must conduct current cadre policy with greater consistency and firmness..." Meanwhile this is one of the most neglected spheres of work. Everything that was criticized—divorce from the masses, excessive paperwork, failure to implement decisions—did not appear out of the blue, there are specific people who are responsible for this. The Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee is simply unable to cope with the growing demand for fresh young forces at many sectors of work. Things were going badly in Ignalinskiy Rayon for a long time and the Central Committee was well aware of the shortcomings in the organizational work of K. Kasnikauskas, the raykom first secretary. However, a principled approach and courage was lacking to squarely face the question and replace the official who was unable to cope with his work. The extent of the stagnation in the rayon is only just coming to light, and there are many more cases like this one. If a more exacting attitude had been adopted and the omissions had been assessed in a principled fashion, the results now would be different too.

People in the republic are only just growing accustomed to criticism and self-criticism—these most important instruments of glasnost and democracy. At previous plenums personal criticism was expressed with extreme caution. As V. Berezov, chief of the Central Committee Organizational Department has rightly noted, the higher a person's position is, the smaller is the dose and the softer is the criticism leveled at him. Alas, the present plenum was no exception. There have been changes in the composition of the Central Committee bureau and the people who have been moved to other jobs were, to all intents and purposes, ignored by the speakers.

For instance, there are many shortcomings in agriculture. However, V. Astrauskas, former Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee secretary and Bureau member, who has become chairman of the Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium was treated as if he were no longer responsible for the errors committed. Or take A. Kayryalis, who until recently headed the People's Control Committee—what was his job in the Central Committee Bureau? That too remained a secret. The work of former Republic Trade Union Council Chairman A. Ferentssas and Vilnius Party Gorkom First Secretary V. Mikuchauskas was passed over in silence... and the upshot is that there is essentially no one to render account, as it were. The new people have not yet

come to grips with their jobs, and the "old" ones have taken up other posts, so it was no accident that in the report too the emphasis was not on the Bureau rendering an exacting account, although omissions were admitted, but on the specification of tasks for lower-level components.

The absence of a critical thrust was reflected in the very atmosphere of the plenum which was too quiet and peaceful. Many speeches, prepared in advance, smacked of self-justification, or were devoted to petty issues, or resembled... economic shopping lists. L. Molotok, republic minister of consumer services delivered a cheerful report. L. Petravichyus, director of the "Akmyantsementas" association spoke in detail about cement production.

To be fair it must be noted that speeches of another kind also rang out at the plenum. Concern was expressed about the insufficient party backup of the switch to new methods of management and the need for broad reliance on primary party organizations where the fate of restructuring will be decided. Ideological work needs serious restructuring.

Changes in national economic management and in economic life in general are taking place, but in ideological work there is little innovation, said V. Azhyalene, a seamstress at the Utena Knitwear Production Association named for M. Melnikyte. Ideological work is being conducted without taking account of the fact that people are getting a lot of information from the newspapers and television, and it still slavishly follows traditional forms and methods.

Life has exposed substantial omissions in the ideological, political, international, and atheist education of the working people which have manifested themselves in bourgeois nationalism, clerical extremism, and in the passiveness of some members of the ideological aktiv.

Restructuring and democratization have livened up the work of cultural establishments and creative unions and have increased their impact on life. However, some members of the creative and scientific intelligentsia are trying to utilize glasnost to settle accounts or to promote cliquishness, and some have gone so far as to totally reject the achievements in the republic's cultural life and the sphere of the protection and restoration of historical and architectural monuments. Unfortunately, it was noted at the plenum, the party organizations of creative unions and higher educational establishments and individual Communists from among the creative and scientific intelligentsia are observing this from the sidelines, as it were, without joining in the polemic. This year marks the 70th anniversary of the foundation of the Lithuanian Communist Party and the proclamation of Soviet power here. These jubilees, the speakers said, must be utilized to promote the working people's patriotic and international education.

Plenum participants noted that the time has come for the newly established Central Committee section and the deputies' standing commission on national relations to make their impact felt. The idea of coordinating the work of ideological establishments in Baltic republics was put forward.

In short, life is presenting us with many problems which urgently demand a solution. In this context, the plenum participants noted, Bureau members—including those mentioned earlier—and also V. Sakalauskas, chairman of the republic Council of Ministers, and A. Brazauskas, Central Committee secretary, must resolutely restructure their work. However, the curtsies of some speakers who described the plenum, long before it had ended, as "exacting, self-critical, and principled" or those who referred—as D. Obrikene, first secretary of the Plungeskiy party raykom, did—to the "Central Committee's constant and tireless concern, and its desire to promote restructuring in every possible way" were not necessarily helpful. In actual fact it is necessary to step up the effort.

Learning every day and teaching others how to work in the new conditions, to display competence and initiative, and to resolutely eradicate petty tutelage and doing economic managers' work—this is what is required now from the republic's party workers, and primarily from the Central Committee secretaries and all members of the Republic Communist Party Central Committee Bureau. This is noted in the plenum resolution and it must be strictly implemented, especially since a further renewal of the Bureau took place at the current plenum. The plenum confirmed that only by ridding ourselves of everything that has outlived its usefulness, can we progress successfully.

Vayno Addresses Estonian Party Plenum
PM041605 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 19 Jan 88 pp 1-3

[ETA report: "Report of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau on Work on the Leadership of Restructuring in the Republican Party Organization delivered by K.G. Vayno, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, at the Seventh Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Excerpts] Comrades!

Today we are holding an unusual and very crucial plenum. In accordance with the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau is putting forward for discussion its report on work on the leadership of restructuring in the republic.

In preparing the report we proceeded from the premise that it is essential to sum up certain results of our work over the past 2 and 1/2 years since the [CPSU] Central Committee April Plenum. This is particularly important

now that the initial stage of restructuring has basically been completed, and we are now moving into the second stage—the practical implementation of what has been planned. It is essential to assess what has been done, and to determine our actions at the new stage.

Moreover, the Central Committee Bureau regards its main task as concentrating its attention on unresolved questions, and on difficult elements in restructuring. During the implementation of economic reform and further democratization it is essential for us to jointly discuss how to restructure our party work more effectively in order to bring the republican party organization up to a new, higher standard enabling it to better resolve the tasks before it.

We expect that during the plenum assessments will be made of the work of the Bureau as a whole and of the personal contribution of each of its members to restructuring, and also, first and foremost, of course, of the work of the Central Committee secretaries. [Passage omitted]

The new economic mechanism is already showing its effectiveness. If it is still inadequate then in the majority of cases this is connected with poor preparation for the switch to the new methods, inadequacies in the organization of production, and weakness in economic services. The insufficient psychological preparedness of our economic management cadres, and the insufficient understanding of the inevitability of the profound changes are also having an effect.

It should be said bluntly that the Central Committee Bureau has not done everything to break down these sentiments, this attitude, and has not sufficiently directed the work of the gorkoms, party raykoms, and party committees of major enterprises in developing economic accountability, and switching enterprises to self-financing and self-recoupment. The members of the Central Committee Bureau, primarily Central Committee Secretary Comrade N. Ganyushov, responsible for this sector of work, did not show sufficient vigor and initiative in giving aid to the economic management cadres of enterprises working in the new conditions, did not make good use of the republic's scientists and leading economists, and did not send expert groups to working collectives where advice and practical assistance was needed.

Our sectorial departments and above all the industrial and economic departments, their chiefs Comrades Ye. Popov and I. Belistov, did not show the essential consistency in monitoring progress in fulfilling party decisions adopted on these questions. Their influence in the organization of cadres' economic training was insufficient. A republican council on these issues was set up under the Central Committee, but its influence on the state of

affairs is still insufficient. In their response to the questionnaire the Central Committee members and the members of the working group on preparations for the plenum indicate this as a serious shortcoming in our work.

The Central Committee Bureau considers that by no means full use has been made of the opportunities which repose in the application of the new system of labor remuneration in the production sphere, which was a kind of prologue to the large-scale introduction of economic accountability and self-financing in the republic's enterprises. [Passage omitted]

It is well-known that the entire above-plan output of consumer goods remains at the republic's disposal, amounting to output worth tens of millions of rubles. But how skillfully are we handling this wealth? How are we influencing the product range? Are we seeking to ensure that this is precisely what is primarily essential to the population? But the republic's Council of Ministers and Gosplan are demonstrating passivity in the search for a way out of the situation which has developed. They should long ago have devised an effective system for influencing the shaping of the range of this above-plan output. The Central Committee Bureau should have demanded this a long time ago. The party gorkoms and raykoms, and party organizations of industrial enterprises and trade organizations are not taking an active stance in ensuring that the population has commodities in sufficient number and variety.

The state of affairs could also be helped by a more active interrepublican exchange of goods, in particular, of those which are produced over and above plan. But neither Comrade K. Todeson, nor Comrade A. Aruvald are showing genuine initiative. The leadership of the Ministry of Trade and the Ministry of Light Industry, and Gosplan should be taking a more active, principled and better reasoned stance on questions of providing the necessary funds.

In resolving all these issues, the coordinating role, initiative, and exactingness of Comrade M. Anslan, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, toward the sectors' leaders should be recognized as insufficient. The leaders of Central Committee departments Comrades R. Merisal and A. Ingerman are not self-critically assessing their role in resolving all these questions. Although they know the difficulty of the problems, they have not prepared the essential proposals in good time. [passage omitted]

Assessing the work of the Central Committee Bureau in the leadership of restructuring in industry, construction, and in the social sphere, it should be said that we often do not have enough consistency and persistence in organizing the monitoring of the solution of major problems of the republic's national economic development. In the opinion of the Central Committee Bureau, Comrade N. Ganyushov, Bureau member and Central

Committee secretary, knows the state of affairs at enterprises but does not always see the pivotal issues on which attention should be focused, and he does not always make an in-depth assessment of the situations which emerge, nor of the prospects for the development of the various sectors of industry. He is not demonstrating genuine persistence in work with union enterprises, the majority of which are in difficulties. The Central Committee members and the members of the working group on preparations for the plenum regard this, in particular, as an omission in the work.

Comrade N. Ganyushov's work on the leadership of the Republican Council for the Promotion of Scientific and Technical Progress also deserves criticism. There is still no real practical return from this council. Once again we have not fulfilled the plan for the development of science and technology, although Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, during his visit to the republic, criticized us precisely for this. [passage omitted]

Serious complaints must be leveled against Comrade Kh. Veldi, candidate member of the Central Committee Bureau and chairman of the Gosagroprom as regards the question of increasing meat production in the republic. The committee of which he is in charge basically still does not have a clear, well considered program of action to deal with the situation. Workers at the sector's headquarters are swamped with routine affairs, they try to deal with a mass of issues all at once, and are so busy "putting out fires," as the saying goes, that they have no time left to look ahead and give thought to problems that may arise and the prospects for solving them. The fact that in many rayons there are no clear programs to pull laggard economic units up to the average level is a serious oversight on the part of the Gosagroprom leadership. The population's vegetable supply is also badly organized. [passage omitted]

As practice shows, many people's understanding of democratization is, so far, one-sided and it is reduced merely to the electivity of cadres. But the meaning of democracy is, after all, immeasurably broader and encompasses a very great deal: the constant and mandatory tackling of all issues of the life and activity of labor collectives, consultation with them, the development of criticism from below, and the strengthening of monitoring by the public. Not everything is going well for us here. It is necessary to study democratism persistently. There will be no movement forward without it.

On this plane the style and methods of the soviets' work must be changed in many respects for, by their very nature they are the most democratic form of management. The leaders of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium must strive more energetically to ensure that the deputies and the deputies' commissions operate more actively and sessions take place without formalism and stage management, and new approaches must be sought.

We must make serious complaints against Comrade A. Ryuytel, member of the Central Committee Bureau. The Supreme Soviet Presidium is not as yet setting the tone in this matter. In a number of places the role played by deputies does not correspond to their high status. It is no secret that people often cannot even remember who they voted for, who their deputy is on the soviet, or how he is protecting their interests. It is also a well known fact that an executive committee apparatus often usurps the elected body, although it really ought to be accountable to the deputies. It is no accident that greater initiative and spontaneity is sometimes shown in village and settlement soviets and in small towns, where there is virtually no apparatus in the executive committees.

It is felt that the leaders of the Trade Union Council and especially its chairman—Comrade M. Pedak, member of the Central Committee Bureau—have not yet managed to give new definition to the role played by trade unions at the present stage in the restructuring process. Many trade union committees are still not managing to escape the constraints of old ideas and still lack initiative and persistency in formulating and solving issues concerning improvement in people's living, working, and leisure conditions. Comrade M. Pedak does not take a sufficiently active stand on the issues of increasing housing construction and establishing subsidiary farms attached to labor collectives.

As far as the work of Comrade A. Almann, candidate member of the Central Committee Bureau and first secretary of the republic Komsomol Central Committee, is concerned, as he himself has rightly pointed out, he has failed to bring major issues concerning young people's interests to the attention of the Bureau. We are aware that the work of the Komsomol Central Committee secretaries is not effective enough and does not involve adequate direct contact with young people. There is a great deal of general discussion about the need to restructure Komsomol activity, but practical action, and assertiveness and independence in the formulation and solution of issues concerning young people, are clearly inadequate. This concerns not only the ideological and political education of young men and women, the organization of youth housing complexes, and the fight against negative developments among young people. Many Komsomol committees are far removed from real life as it is lived by young people and from the processes taking place among them and consequently do not have the necessary influence.

Of course, the responsibility for all this also rests with the Central Committee Bureau and party committees.

The democratization process has engendered new forms of voluntary social activity—the Culture Foundation and Children's Foundation have been established and self-active associations and various self-active initiative groups have appeared with their own interests and

leaders. On the whole this is a logical, positive phenomenon. The Central Committee Bureau believes that support should be given to people who are sincerely concerned with preserving historical cultural values and nature. It is precisely for this reason that the Central Committee Bureau felt it expedient and useful to establish the Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments in the republic. The decision has also been taken to form societies for photography, cinema, and video enthusiasts.

However, the passive attitude of some party and soviet organs and their lack of control over unofficial associations has led to a situation where the initiative and leadership in some of these associations being taken by absolutely anyone with a penchant for social demagoguery. Party gorkoms and raykoms and soviet organs must keep a good eye on these processes and guide the activity of unofficial associations, particularly when it concerns young people. It is unfortunate that the republic Komsomol Central Committee often only finds out about the existence of some groups and associations as a result of something negative happening.

The Central Committee Bureau must be more persistent in drawing the attention of party gorkoms and raykoms to the need to develop new forms of voluntary activity on the basis of healthy, constructive principles and enhance the role of Communists and Komsomol members in these organizations.

The new conditions in which people have to live and work have had a great influence on the ideological situation. According to the Central Committee Bureau, it is more complicated now than a year ago. Today it is distinguished by the appreciable democratization and improvement of sociopolitical life, the development of glasnost, and the awakening of citizens' social activeness, as well as by the presence of various antisocial phenomena and attempts by some nationalists and people who are even hostile to socialism to play a role in the political arena. Evidence of this is the organization of gatherings of nationalistically inclined elements, the revival of certain unregistered extremist groups of a religious nature, and attempts to stir people up by acts of vandalism. Having begun with demands to "decipher the 'lacunae' in history" and "restore justice to the victims of the personality cult period," they have rapidly progressed to direct agitation for a revision of the history of the Estonian people and the Estonian Communist Party from a bourgeois standpoint and attempts to compromise socialism and prominent Estonian revolutionaries and, at the same time, rehabilitate those who fought against young Soviet power in Estonia. The main aims of nationalistically inclined elements are to shake our foundations, undermine friendship between the Soviet peoples, and force a path for separatist ideas. There is now a clear trend toward eroding the class concept and idealizing the bourgeois republic. Clear attempts are also being made to play on national feeling by exaggerating

the republic's exclusiveness and special features. Unfortunately, echoes of these sentiments and ideas are leaking into the press and onto the air in various guises. We certainly must not underestimate these phenomena.

The Central Committee Bureau very bluntly and self-critically admits that the sphere of educational and ideological work in the republic is failing to keep pace with the present situation more than any other sphere.

There are several reasons why the ideological situation has become complicated. First of all it is important to understand that the conditions in which our party organizations have to work have abruptly changed. We are moving away from regulated conduct in the ideological sphere and toward discussions and polemics on various issues. Mistaken ideas are sometimes to be heard during these polemics—sometimes categorically and emotionally expressed, thereby arousing an unhealthy interest. Often these mistaken opinions are not properly rebuffed by Communists and consequently misinform public opinion.

This mainly results from feeble organization of party political work in labor collectives, particularly at the lower levels. Many secretaries of party organizations, ideological workers, and rank-and-file Communists are not prepared to conduct an open discussion with people about topical problems. Far from all of them know how to distinguish between democracy and demagoguery, glasnost and total licence, criticism and slander, and to distinguish ignorance of historical logic from a convinced rejection of socialism and its values.

Naturally, the ideological situation is also affected by economic factors—a certain complication of the socio-economic situation which is possible in the initial stages of restructuring, when the old economic mechanism is still in operation and the new one has yet to get off the ground, while the consumer can see no real, appreciable results produced by restructuring in the form of brisker trade in consumer goods and improvement in public services, which is causing some dissatisfaction and skepticism among some people. Some elements are making use of this to a certain extent. We also cannot ignore the fact that some people in the republic are discontented and still mourn the economic and political privileges they enjoyed under the bourgeois system. We should particularly bear it in mind that various hostile radio stations have appreciably stepped up their activity recently, making use of our democratization and glasnost and the open discussion of our urgent problems and unresolved issues as a screen to inflame nationalist feelings by playing on the fact that some people are unsophisticated, not fully informed, and politically immature.

What conclusions can and must be drawn from all this?

We have still not learned how to work in the new conditions. We do not react quickly enough to new phenomena and problems which arise. Not all our ideological cadres know how to assess a situation correctly and in depth or foresee possible situations and potential negative developments.

Extremists, hostile elements, and foreign radio stations exploit our weak spots, where we are still experiencing shortcomings, and the problems to which we are not devoting enough attention. They operate among people who we often do not reach: In small collectives, small offices, restoration workshops, and small organizations, where party influence is inadequate. It is in these places that all manner of false rumors are most often fomented and politically immature opinions abound. It is no accident that hostile elements avoid plants and large labor collectives, knowing in advance that they will find no support there, and so they draw people to the outskirts and to cemeteries, preferring the hours of darkness.

Party committees are often poorly informed on the real situation at grassroots level and do not know enough about the way people really live and think. It is precisely for this reason that the Vyruskiy Estonian Communist Party Raykom failed to correctly assess the scale of a rowdy meeting that was in the offing and its political thrust.

Party organizations often evade tricky questions, try to turn a blind eye to immature, sometimes even hostile statements by some people, do not display a principled attitude, and do not give a proper rebuttal. Consequently some labor collectives have not managed to condemn and fundamentally appraise the actions of people involved in antisocial gatherings. This, perhaps, is one of the most alarming features of the current ideological situation.

The Central Committee Bureau has noted that the move by party committees and party organizations in the direction of seriously analyzing and solving the problems of patriotic and international education is too slow. They do not everywhere properly assess the ideological consequences of various measures and their possible impact in light of the actual ideological situation. The city of Pyarnu, for example, organized an exhibition entitled "Making the Best of a Bad Job," which showed faulty goods supplied by construction material enterprises in other union republics, mainly the RSFSR. The organizers of the exhibition probably had good intentions, but it backfired nevertheless. The people who visited the exhibition could not help but form the impression that enterprises outside the republic mainly employed only slipshod workmen. Judging by the things people said and their entries in the visitors book, the exhibition did nothing to strengthen friendly relations with supply collectives, and as their representatives did not actually attend the exhibition, it did not help matters a great deal.

The program for the international and patriotic education of the population and young people is now being supplemented. The Central Committee has formed a sector for counterpropaganda and inter-nation relations. Guidelines for dealing with the most complex issues are being worked out to help gorkoms, raykoms, and primary party organizations, as well as methodological material and calendars of counterpropaganda days. Special working groups have been set up to examine "sore points" in the republic's economic, social, and cultural life. Appearances by leading workers at republic level are being organized on television and radio, at press conferences, and on integrated political theme days to give explanations on the most topical problems of general interest. It must be admitted in self-criticism that not every Central Committee Bureau member is taking a really active approach to conducting this work among the people.

When preparing for the plenum, Central Committee members and members of the working groups expressed the opinion that one of the most important functions of the Central Committee Bureau with regard to leading ideological activity is to forecast the ideological situation in the republic and thoroughly analyze and consider the impact all decisions taken by republic and union organs will have upon it. The Bureau believes that this is a correct statement of the issue. It will be guided by this in its activity. [passage omitted]

The Central Committee Bureau believes that our republic party newspapers must now take far more active stances. Precisely they must set the tone, correct their comrades in the journalists' shop, come out against erroneous judgments, and shape public opinion on the most important questions of restructuring.

It has to be admitted that the Central Committee Bureau, the Central Committee Propaganda and Agitation Department, and Comrade S.-A. Villo, its chief, do not ensure efficient party leadership of the work of the mass media. There is no well thought-out system of press guidance under the new conditions or constant work with journalists.

Today we speak a great deal about the mass media and criticize certain omissions and excesses in their work. But let no one get the impression that someone on the Central Committee wants in this way to curtail glasnost. No, no! Here too it is appropriate once again to use Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's words: "We advocate glasnost without any reservation, without restriction. But it must be glasnost in the interests of socialism."

Now, at a time of restructuring, the social role of the creative intelligentsia has increased appreciably. It possesses great potential for shaping new views.

Increased interest in problems of history, ecology, and the economic, social, and public life of the republic is to be observed among the creative intelligentsia today, and

this is important. The Central Committee Bureau has treated and will treat with great attention the creative intelligentsia's proposals and the questions raised by it. We must meet more frequently with writers, artists, and artists.

The restructuring of party leadership in the sphere of artistic creativity demands of the Bureau members, the Central Committee Culture Department, and Comrade T. Koldits, its chief, increased attention to the creative unions' party organizations, a search for new, more flexible and effective forms of work, and open, confident, constructive relations with literary and art figures.

Central Committee Secretary R. Ristlaan is personally responsible for the state of ideological work: Under the conditions of the rapidly developing democratization of social life he has failed to ensure the efficient functioning of the system of ideological actions, particularly in international education, counterpropaganda, and the struggle against nationalist manifestations. This is most noticeable in party leadership of the press, where Comrade Ristlaan has lost his influence over certain editors and leading journalists. It is also a bad thing that he sometimes still tries to resolve complex questions in an officious style and is guilty of subjectivism in assessments. Comrade Ristlaan does not always heed the opinion of specialists. The intelligentsia's taste for social creativity has increased in the course of restructuring—many philosophers, economists, and historians have come up with new, nonstandard ideas, but the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Ideological Commission has shown no interest in them.

Last October Comrade R.E. Ristlaan, self-critically assessing his work, asked the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau to release him from his work, as he was failing to cope with the duties of Estonian Communist Party Central Committee secretary for ideology.

The Central Committee Bureau considered Comrade R.E. Ristlaan's application and decided to meet his request. In this connection an organizational question has been included on the plenum agenda. [passage omitted]

Comrades! The Central Committee Bureau is concluding its report. A number of assessments of the work of Bureau members and candidate members have already been heard today. There is also a need to assess the activities of other comrades.

The Council of Ministers and its chairman—Comrade B. Saul—deal with very many questions of life in the republic. But there are particularly important, central questions which have been advanced to the fore today and which demand increased attention and new

approaches. These include improving the supply of foodstuffs and industrial goods to the population and implementing the housing program. If there is no real, qualitative improvement in these questions, the work of the Council of Ministers cannot be considered satisfactory. At present not all these questions are being properly resolved. Furthermore, the Council of Ministers adopts many necessary decisions, but the monitoring of their fulfillment is not organized as it should be today, and Comrade B. Saul is responsible for this too.

Comrades N. Yuganson, K. Kortelainen, E.-A. Sillari, and V. Liiv, members of the Central Committee Bureau, and Comrades I. Toome and G. Tynspoyeg, candidate members of the Bureau, are also guilty of shortcomings in their work. Their contribution to the preparation and examination of questions in the Bureau could be more significant, and they could display greater initiative and make more suggestions on major problems affecting life in the republic.

If we speak of shortcomings in the work of the Central Committee first secretary, it would be fair, above all, to apply to him too the remarks made here about the work of the Central Committee Bureau and its members, as he is answerable for all this. It is he who must ensure the Bureau's fruitful collective work. Also, he must not allow Bureau members to accumulate shortcomings. He must be able to notice them in time, draw attention to this in a comradely way, make suggestions, and give assistance.

Taking a large-scale view, it has to be said that I must answer for the fact that restructuring is still proceeding slowly in the republic party organization and has gained insufficient momentum and that the negative nationalist manifestations occurring in the republic do not always receive a proper rebuff.

On a personal plane, I must be among people more, not do work for the Central Committee departments in generalizing and analyzing the restructuring processes and formulating the necessary measures, and be more exacting toward others.

A kind of criticism or, perhaps, something more—a charging of the atmosphere—has recently been spreading among us: It is alleged that Comrades Vayno, Saul, and Ryuytel, the republic's leaders, show scant concern for the republic's needs and do not raise with the center questions of reducing the republic's meat and milk deliveries to the all-union stocks, although these figures, for which we receive feed from the state, as is known, were determined for the entire 5-year plan as much as 3 years ago. They do not seek an additional allocation of mixed feed, a reduction in deliveries of scarce consumer goods, and so forth. Of course, questions of supply have always been acute and attracted close attention. Particularly now that, as we have already said, there are very many difficulties in the country. Therefore, to be brief, these allegations are groundless, and they are made from the false premise that we are supposedly feeding and

clothing virtually the whole country. That is a mistaken approach. The republic's leaders should, rather, be criticized for the fact that, while knowing the true difficult situation in the country, they still raise these questions with the center. Incidentally, the union government, taking our difficulties into account, has now helped us by giving us 1,000 tonnes of meat from centralized funds without repayment.

We are probably to blame for the fact that we are still poorly overcoming freeloading sentiments—demanding more from the state. That would be a fair criticism.

But in general, comrades, I wish to say that the Bureau is working in a harmonious, collective manner. A principled discussion takes place at our sessions. We have met repeatedly to assess the work of the Bureau as a whole and the activity of each individual. At the same time, sharp criticism has been heard. There is unity of views within the Bureau on questions of principle, and all this is a guarantee of harmonious, concerted work in the future.

Of course, we realize that the report submitted to you today does not entirely and fully cover all questions. In no way do we consider our assessments to be final and all-embracing. We reckon that today's plenum will see an earnest and principled discussion in the spirit of true party comradeship on ways to improve our work and increase the personal contribution of each Bureau member to the renewal of all aspects of the life of the republic party organization.

In conclusion I would like to say, comrades, that at the stage of restructuring which we are now entering we are faced with a great deal of painstaking, creative work. It will take the strenuous application of all our strength, and the success of restructuring in the republic will depend on this.

Zaykov Addresses Radio Ministry Collegium

PM091107 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Feb 88
Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Sector's Important Tasks"]

[Text] The radio industry is the leading sector for supplying the national economy with computer equipment, planning automation systems, air traffic control systems, and domestic radioelectronic equipment.

The results of its activity in 1987 and the tasks of restructuring its work in the light of the party Central Committee's demands and ensuring the fulfillment of the 1988 plan targets and the 12th 5-Year Plan as a whole were examined at a 5 February session of the USSR Radio Industry Ministry Collegium.

V.I. Shimko, USSR minister of the radio industry, delivered the report.

The collegium participants critically analyzed the state of affairs and pointed to a number of serious shortcomings in the sector's work. Questions of the preparations to introduce economic accountability [khozyaystvennyy raschet] and self-financing in enterprises, the restructuring of the sector's management, and the acceleration of the pace of its social development were examined particularly attentively.

L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, addressed the collegium session.

After noting the high scientific and technical standard of many developments, he voiced concern at the low growth rates for production of consumer goods, computer equipment, and other types of output and at the falling level of fulfillment of contract pledges. The technical standard and quality of domestic radio apparatus leave something to be desired.

The chief reason for the present state of affairs, L.N. Zaykov emphasized, is that the work style of the sector's headquarters does not accord with modern demands or the new management methods. In this connection emphasis was placed on the special importance of preparing the sector to work under conditions of economic accountability and self-financing, the new management structure, and the operation of the Law on the State Enterprise.

This year, the year of the 19th all-union party conference, must be a turning point for the sector. Special attention must be paid to the need to raise the technological standard of production, develop the sector's machine-building capacities, and more actively resolve social and domestic questions. Note was also taken of the need to accelerate the pace of modernizing and retooling scientific research institutes and industrial enterprises situated in Moscow, which constitute a significant part of the ministry's scientific and industrial potential.

Participating in the collegium's work were D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense; Yu.D. Maslyukov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; O.S. Belyakov, chief of a CPSU Central Committee department; senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, the USSR Gosplan, ministries, and departments, and leaders and secretaries of the party committees of a number of the sector's enterprises and organizations.

Vlasov Attends Moscow MVD Organs' Meeting

PM091139 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 88 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Collegium Session"]

[Text] An enlarged session of the Moscow Gorispolkom Main Administration for Internal Affairs Collegium attended by party raykom secretaries, rayispolkom chairman, and chiefs and party committee secretaries from

rayon internal affairs administrations has examined the results of work on the strengthening of law and order and socialist legality in the city in 1987.

The report by P.S. Bogdanov, chief of the Moscow Gorispolkom Main Administration for Internal Affairs, noted that, as a result of measures taken, crime has declined and positive changes have taken place with regard to improving the moral atmosphere in the city.

At the same time, there has been no fundamental improvement in the struggle against antisocial phenomena. Work on overcoming drunkenness and alcoholism has slackened. Crime among minors has increased, and there has been no reduction in the number of thefts from apartments and motor vehicle thefts.

The restructuring of the activity of some rayon internal affairs administrations in conditions of expanding democracy and glasnost is progressing only slowly. Violations of socialist legality still occur. The main administration collegium still provides insufficient coordination of the activity of militia organ services in the struggle against unearned income.

The session defined measures to improve the structure and activity of the Main Administration for Internal Affairs and its subdivisions. It set the task of further improving party political work.

The session was addressed by USSR Internal Affairs Minister A.V. Vlasov and Moscow Gorispolkom Chairman V.T. Saykin.

Taking part in the collegium's work were Yu.A. Belyakov and Yu.S. Karabasov, secretaries of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom; A.I. Griyenko, instructor at the CPSU Central Committee; and V.I. Gladyshev, chief of the USSR MVD Political Administration.

Militia HQ Holds Briefing on Crime Statistics

*LD101256 Moscow TASS in English 1233 GMT
10 Feb 88*

[Text] Moscow February 10 TASS—Correspondent Nikita Demidov writes:

Soviet and foreign journalists were told at a briefing at the Moscow militia headquarters today that rules of residence registration in the city have been changed as a result of the further democratization of Soviet society. Under past regulations people convicted for serious crimes were denied residence registration in Moscow after they had completed their sentences. Practice showed that family ties were thus restricted, that the former convicts tried one way or another to live in Moscow thus leading to violations of various regulations and, consequently, to new punishments.

The Moscow City Soviet of People's Deputies has adopted a decision under which Muscovites after serving out their sentence for the first serious crime can be registered in the homes of their family or parents. But those who have been convicted two or more times can get residence registration in Moscow only if they are gravely ill and have to be looked after by relatives, are disabled, have small children or disabled parents. Permission for such registration, of course, will be granted on a case-by-case basis on decision of militia authorities.

It was announced at the briefing that during the past week there were 2 murders in Moscow, 5 aggravated assaults, 24 robberies, 47 apartments were looted and 11 motor vehicles stolen. Three persons were arrested on charges of inflicting serious bodily harm. Eight persons died in the 103 road accidents that happened during the week. An analysis of January and the first week of February shows a decline in the number of crimes in Moscow, in particular serious crimes.

International Church Conference Held

*LD052234 Moscow TASS in English 2041 GMT
5 Feb 88*

[Text] Leningrad February 5 TASS—Problems of cultural legacy of the Russian Orthodox Church have been discussed at the Third International Church Conference devoted to the millennium of Christianity in Russia. The conference ended in Leningrad today. It drew representatives of churches from 20 countries, UNESCO officials, specialists in architecture, fine arts and language studies.

Theologians and scholars considered a broad range of questions linked with the history of Russian church art, mutual enrichment of Russia and neighbouring states in culture and religion.

The conference held by the Russian Orthodox church promoted the deepening of fraternal relations between churches, says a communique which was passed.

Aviation Officials Accept PRAVDA Criticism

*PM100909 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Feb 88
Second Edition p 2*

[Response to PRAVDA by A. Volkov, USSR minister of civil aviation, Ye. Bubnov, ministry party committee secretary, and V. Kolchanov, chief of the Civil Aviation Political Administration, under the rubric "PRAVDA Spoke Out. What Has Been Done?": "Ministry of Closed Doors"]

[Text] The article entitled "Ministry of Closed Doors," published in PRAVDA on 27 December 1987, has been discussed in the party organizations of all subdivisions and at an enlarged session of the Ministry of Civil Aviation party committee. The Communists noted that the newspaper pointedly and from a principled standpoint shed light on a number of problems impeding the

development of glasnost, democratization and the elimination of shortcomings and miscalculations in cadre work by the party committee, party organizations, and Communists among the ministry's leaders.

The party committee acknowledged as fair the criticism of shortcomings in work on prospects for the development of civil aviation and to prepare for the sector's switch to the new economic management conditions. The decisions adopted in a number of instances are not marked by a specific and principled approach. The newspaper's criticism regarding the penalties applied by the party committee to Communist Yu. Bulanov, chief of a Central Air Traffic Administration department, is also justified. Deputy Minister Communist I. Vasin has been instructed to take measures to eliminate the conflict in the Civil Aviation Central Air Traffic Administration.

Party organizations have been told to plan specific measures to develop democratization and glasnost in the ministry apparatus, to eliminate shortcomings in cadre work, to improve the style and methods of work, and to preclude instances of protectionism and other negative phenomena.

The article has also been examined at a special session of the ministry's collegium. The criticism has been deemed correct. Until recently aviation incidents were not made public. Situations connected with the shortage of aviation fuel and delays and late flights caused by a lack of proper organization and order were covered up with the standard formula—"technical reasons." Certain aspects of Aeroflot's activity on international routes were not made public. Instances of unjustified replacements of cadres and protectionism when assigning specialists to travel abroad took place in administrations, enterprises, and the apparatus. There were violations of labor legislation and the disciplinary code for civil aviation personnel. Some of them have still not been eliminated.

The collegium drew the attention of O. Smirnov, deputy minister of civil aviation, and A. Yefimenko, chief of the Ministry of Civil Aviation Cadres Administration, to the need to more persistently pursue the principled cadre policy laid down by the 27th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum, intensify the struggle against protectionism, nepotism and other negative phenomena, and adopt additional measures to improve work with cadres abroad.

The collegium strictly censured S. Yefimurkin, chief of the ministry's legislative department, for serious shortcomings in work and demanded that he ensure rigorous observance of labor legislation and the disciplinary code for the sector's workers. V. Shelkovnikov, chief of the Central Air Traffic Administration, was censured for inadequate work to rally the administration's collective and was warned of the need for strict observance of labor legislation and correct application of the disciplinary code for civil aviation workers.

Measures to eliminate the shortcomings noted in the article have been outlined by the collegium, the Civil Aviation Political Administration, and the ministry party committee. The question of improving the ministry's style and method of work will be discussed at a collegium session in the first quarter of this year. The question of the progress and results of restructuring in work with cadres and measures to improve it will also be discussed at a meeting of the ministry apparatus party aktiv.

A check failed to establish instances of protectionism in the promotion of R. Ambartsumyan. At that time V. Samorukov was on an extended foreign business trip and could not have influenced his transfer. At the same time, in the light of the prevailing situation, the collegium considered it expedient to transfer V. Samorukov to other work.

The PRAVDA article will have a positive effect on the development of the processes of democratization and glasnost in the sector.

Workers Complain of Pollution, Food Supplies
PM081029 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 88
Second Edition p 3

[Letter from I. Grinko, T. Vilchinskaya, O. Gavrilova, and others under rubric "Rejoinder": "To Moscow For a Biscuit"]

[Text] We work at the Achinsk Alumina Combine. We are proud of the fact that it is a leading enterprise in the Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy. But we would like to ask this: Why has restructuring in our area affected only the production sphere and left daily life in the city untouched?

Achinsk is literally suffocating with dust. Our combine alone pumps more than 600 tonnes of dust into the atmosphere every day—this is the official figure given by the Labor Safety Department. No one has ever said a word in public about what our lives are going to be like in the future or what we are going to do about cleaning up the city's atmosphere.

What do the stores sell?.... We can put up with the absence of quality industrial goods: We are used to having to buy everything we need when we are on leave, rushing through the stores in Moscow, Leningrad, and the Baltic republics. We see no meat, butter, canned vegetables, or fresh fish for months on end. Fats, macaroni, and groats periodically disappear from the shelves. Sugar and tea supplies are erratic. We have to go to Moscow if we want to buy biscuits. The dairy product situation has improved, although the choice does not extend beyond milk and sour cream.

Representatives of the Workers Supply Department and the gorispolkom meet with the population. The discussions are frank and to the point. We hear the same

answer to all our questions: Our quotas are exhausted. But you have to fight even for these quotas and—most important of all—our kray is a rich one, not all our internal reserves have been brought into play. The local soviet ispolkoms and the party kraykom must not calmly sit back and watch but take more vigorous action and solve these urgent problems.

I. Grinko, T. Volchinskaya, O. Garvilova, and others (65 signatures in all).

Achinsk, Krasnoyarsk Kray.

Roy Medvedev on Bukharin's Rehabilitation
PM101050 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian
6 Feb 88 pp 1,9

[Telephone interview with Soviet historian Roy Medvedev by Alberto Jacoviello; date, place not given]

[Text] Moscow—"Roy Aleksandrovich, may we hear your immediate response to the news." "I consider it very important and it fills me with joy," Roy Medvedev said over the telephone. "I must add, however, that the Supreme Court decision is very belated. Indeed everyone has known for many years that those people were innocent and unjustly condemned. The veil that it was attempted to draw over that period was torn aside by the 20th congress in 1956. Justice could have been done at any time after that, therefore."

[Jacoviello] You are well aware, though, that it was not an easy decision. All kinds of disagreements emerged and the press has reported them.

[Medvedev] I am perfectly aware of the truth of what you say. However, this does not alter the fact that it is painful to see what slow progress is being made at a time when in fact society needs to proceed quickly, at least with regard to the truth about its own past.

[Jacoviello] I see that only 10 of the 21 sentenced at that trial were rehabilitated. Why?

[Medvedev] For one thing, some of those sentenced have already been rehabilitated over the years. They were minor figures who posed no particular political problems. For this reason in their case it was possible to proceed more quickly and without any particular publicity.

[Jacoviello] What about Yagoda?

[Medvedev] It seems clear to me why he was excluded. He was not guilty of the crimes with which he was charged in the 1938 trial. However, he said in court that Kirov's assassination, which he organized, was sponsored by Bukharin and Trotskiy. This is clearly untrue. However, the problem posed by that false testimony is a very major one. Hence the suspension of judgment.

[Jacoviello] Do you believe that it can nevertheless be said that Thursday's decision reopens the entire debate on Bukharin's political stances?

[Medvedev] Definitely. This seems to me inevitable now. However, it will be a difficult debate because it is a difficult problem.

After Difficulties, Kirov Movie Reaches TV
PM091517 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 3 Feb 88 p 2

[I. Ivanovskiy article under the rubric "Television Premiere": "Soldier of the Revolution"; boldface as published]

[Text] Leningrad—A new documentary movie about Kirov, "Time of Hopes," will be shown on Central Television today and tomorrow. [Footnote] (Time of Hope [Vremya Nadezhd]. Director L. Cherentsov. Scriptwriters L. Cherentsov and A. Dinkevich. Leningrad Studio for Documentary Movies, 1987)

The movie does not show much of Sergey Mironovich himself—only the footage that has been preserved in the archives. But Kirov is so firmly linked with the epoch that this most interesting movie chronicle, running for 90 minutes and depicting the civil war, the Baku oil fields, and Leningrad's First 5-Year Plan, might just as well be about him.

Why is it that the movie "Time of Hope" hits the nail so squarely on the head and appears more contemporary than contemporary works? We are talking about a coupling of Lenin's democracy in the twenties and Lenin's democracy in the eighties. Our future depends on the precision of this coupling, and the paramount question today is: How is man to be approached, how are our people to be rallied for the sake of the common cause? Kirov answers this question exhaustively and graphically. He learned well from Lenin, he was approachable, easy to understand, and accessible to people, and he lived among the masses.

Leningrad, just like the entire country, found the First 5-Year Plan an unusually tough nut to crack. The most complex problems were intertwined, and who could make head or tail of it! But Kirov was primarily interested in how workers were being fed in the canteens, whether baths had hot running water, and whether the Komsomol was overlooking physical culture. He started not with the problems but with the man, with man's simplest and vital needs.

Do you know who addressed the audience after one of the movie's previews? Vassa Romanovna Filippova, who was party obkom instructor in Kirov's time. Vassa Romanovna is 86 years old, but she has not succumbed to old age; she is an active public figure. Her life-style could not be more modest. Her table is always covered with papers: Vassa Romanovna is writing her memoirs.

Vassa Romanovna was in charge of the speakers' department. This assignment was pure Kirov. Kirov wanted to know on a daily basis the problems raised by workers.

Zhdanov, as soon as he took over Kirov's vacant office, abolished the speakers' department.

Seemingly useless footage lay forgotten for many years on end. But the director has brought it together, brought it into focus, and we see before us a broad picture of life in Leningrad in the twenties and thirties. Street scenes. Life in railroad cars—there was a shortage of housing. Evening gatherings at the seat of culture—this is how the club was known.

The movie probably contains elements which could be professionally disputed. But the main point is that it shows us a Man and an Epoch which created each other.

The movie "Time of Hope" has taken 10 years to reach the audience. The difficulties lay not just in the vast amount or poor quality of film that had to be viewed. Yesterday's people in high places were unwilling to remember Kirov and would not let others remember him.

One eminent Leningrad personality was annoyed at yet another begging visit by the moviemakers and told them: "I'm fed up with you—Kirov, Kirov. It's high time to forget."

Statutes of limitation do not apply to history. It is impossible to move forward without the full historical truth.

Don't miss this movie!

Alma-Ata Mud Flow Damage Due to 'Carelessness'

LD072027 Moscow Television Service
in Russian 1530 GMT 7 Feb 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] As has already been reported, a powerful mud flow has passed through Alma-Ata Oblast.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] This is where the mud flow erupted from. The volume of water in the Lake Zhamankum reservoir exceeded all tolerable limits, and the sands, already soaked through, began to move. The mighty torrent burst into the River Kaske-lenka. As it turned out, the calamity could have been prevented.

[G.N. Maltsev, deputy chairman of Alma-Ata Oblispolkom—identified by caption] Yes, people showed carelessness here. A huge amount of the blame in this lies on the operational staff, those who are directly responsible for operating sewage purification installations, for

the canal, for the reservoir, for the execution of their immediate functions in operating the reservoir. We will look into this, and the comrades will suffer the appropriate punishment.

[Correspondent] Gennadiy Nikolayevich, how are things with the people who live in these regions?

[Maltsev] We think that approximately 30 million cubic meters of water went into the Kapchagay Reservoir, together with sand and mud flows. All necessary measures have been taken so that the people in the town of Kapchagay do not drink the water. On the very first night, Artesian wells were dug. All of the water which goes into the drinking water supply of Kapchagay meets state standards and sanitary requirements.

[Correspondent] Work is in full swing where the natural disaster occurred. The necessary aid is being extended to the population. Road and rail traffic on the route from Alma-Ata to Taldy-Kurgan has been urgently restored. These are temporary installations for the moment; new major bridges are being built alongside. The price of carelessness and negligence has been high. [video shows snowy landscape, steep gorge of river valley, construction of temporary bridges, vehicles and train crossing bridges over fast-flowing river] [end recording]

Economic

Rytov on 'Complex, Contradictory' Shortages

PM101037 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Feb 88
Morning Edition p 1

[Yu. Rytov article under the rubric "Statistics and Our Commentary": "This Ineradicable Deficit"]

[Text] The USSR State Committee for Statistics has reported that in 1987 the average monthly wage of workers and employees in the national economy was R201, as against R196 in 1986. Kolkhoz members' average wages increased from R163 to R167.

People's earnings are growing. They are growing even faster than envisaged by the plan. Of course, this cannot fail to gratify us. But here's the rub: Monetary income has considerably outstripped trade turnover and the consumption fund. In terms of total volume last year's trade turnover plan was not fulfilled to the tune of R12.6 billion. We fell another R2.7 billion short in paid services. True, the target for savings bank deposits was exceeded—by approximately R4 billion. Yet, as we can see, this can in no way compensate for the overall losses in the cash plan. The population's income does not match expenditure....

We are getting complaints from various parts of the country, A.V. Voylukov, USSR Gosbank Monetary Circulation Administration chief, commented on the situation, that wage payments are being delayed. This is indeed so. But what can local Gosbank offices do if they

fail to collect a sufficient amount of money? Local soviets have now been made responsible for fulfilling the cash plan. If good use is made of local potential there will be no difficulties in financial circulation. But we have few such regions. Belorussia, the Baltic republics, and certain RSFSR oblasts—Ulyanovsk Oblast, for instance. Unfortunately, most regions are not yet displaying any particular urgency. According to preliminary calculations, the trade turnover targets were not met in January, either....

Analyzing the USSR State Committee for Statistics figures on the production of consumer goods, one's attention invariably turns to a strange feature of the work of our enterprises and whole sectors. The production of precisely those items for which demand is greatest is growing at a slow rate. As a result goods shortages are not only not diminishing but are actually increasing.

Take, for instance, production of light industry goods for young people. Their proportion of the total volume of corresponding goods remains insignificant. Thus, production of hosiery and knitwear with the code "Mol" accounts for just 6-8 percent of total production. Sewn goods account for 5 percent. Footwear accounts for 7 percent. Textiles and notions account for just 0.3 percent. As an age group, however, young people (16-29) make up one-fifth of the population. It is easy to imagine the gaps there would be in the cash plan if, for instance, trade orders for young people's raincoats were less than 10 percent satisfied.

The entire range of light industry goods is not being adequately renewed. Last year the renewal of goods remained at the 1986 level (24 percent of total production). For certain types of output the proportion of "N"-coded items even fell. Last year USSR Ministry of Light Industry enterprises failed to supply their customers with a total of R1 billion worth of output and goods covered by agreed contracts. R1 billion worth of precisely the output that customers ask for in the stores....

The commodity shortage is also being exacerbated by the poor work of a number of enterprises in the machine building complex and the chemical and timber complex that produce consumer goods. Thus, sales of refrigerators and freezers not only did not increase last year compared with 1986 but even fell. The demand for progressive models of radio receivers, televisions, tape recorders, and washing machines remains acute. Yet all this equipment costs quite a lot of money....

The situation is exacerbated by the fact that the shortage is, amazingly, accompanied by surpluses. Why? Because enterprises are continuing to produce goods that are not in demand. Unmarketable and slow-moving goods of obsolete models, styles, and designs worth R1.4 billion have now built up in the trade network.

It is proving quite impossible to overcome the shortage of timber and construction materials. True, sales of them did increase 20 percent last year compared with the preceding year. However, the set target was fulfilled by only 49 percent. This included 26 percent in the RSFSR and 36 percent in Kazakhstan....

Sales of commercial production waste and substandard products are organized extremely poorly. The annual target was fulfilled by just 50 percent here. Such products are marketed by just over 2,000 stores, of which only approximately 600 are specialized.

It is also quite impossible to regard the development of the network of paid services to the population as satisfactory. The annual plan in terms of this indicator was fulfilled by 95.2 percent. Of the 47 ministries and departments which were set targets for the development of paid services, these targets were met by just...6 of them.

An acute shortage in many types of services also continues to be felt. The population complains particularly about the long time taken to carry out all kinds of repairs and about their poor quality—be they repairs to an apartment or a car, to furniture or refrigerators.... Letters about this are frequently encountered in the editors' mail. A particularly large number of complaints comes from rural localities. Yet consumer service enterprises have been working under the new management conditions for more than a year. What can account for all their deficiencies? Economic levers are still being brought into action very slowly. Economic accountability [khozraschet], the team contract, the contract system, and other progressive forms of labor organization and compensation are being introduced feebly....

The situation in our national economy in the present transitional period is complex and contradictory. On the one hand, there are vigorous measures ensuring fair labor compensation. On the other, there are complexities in providing goods and services for the money earned. The issuing [emissiya] of money, the threat of inflationary processes.

But can we wait calmly for the transitional period to end and for the economic reform to produce its full return? Of course not. So what, then, can be done right now to intensify the struggle against shortages?

The answer is probably very simple. It is necessary, first of all, to overcome the shortage of attention.

Attention to people's specific needs and aspirations.

Nikitenkov Explains Enterprises' Insurance Plans
PM091141 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Feb 88
Morning Edition p 2

[Yu. Kogtev interview with L. Nikitenkov, USSR State Insurance Main Administration deputy chief, under the headline "The State Insurance Main Administration Will Protect Enterprises"; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] It is planned to introduce state insurance in 1989 to protect the assets of enterprises which have transferred to full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing.

Fires, accidents, natural disasters, and other unforeseen events have occurred in production activity in the past. So why has the need to provide enterprises with state insurance protection only been raised now? I put this question to L. Nikitenkov, USSR State Insurance Main Administration deputy chief.

[Nikitenkov] The answer is obvious: Economic management conditions have changed. Whereas in the past damages caused by natural disasters were covered by a one-off payment from ministry funds and the state budget, today the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) clearly states that "any shortfall in circulating capital is made up out of the collective's economically accountable income and this capital is topped up from its own resources." The transition to operating under the conditions of full economic accountability and self-financing not only signifies greater independence for enterprises and organizations but also increases their responsibility to maintain their fixed and circulating capital.

Consequently, the need has arisen to provide insurance protection for enterprises' assets against damage incurred as a result of various unforeseen events: fire, earthquake, landslide, flooding, hurricane, lightning, explosion, accident—including accidents at nuclear power stations—and so forth. The intention is to introduce this kind of insurance at industrial, construction, transport, and communications enterprises which have transferred to full economic accountability and self-financing.

[Kogtev] But most enterprises will begin to operate under these conditions this year, although it is only planned to introduce insurance next year. How will damages be compensated in the immediate future?

[Nikitenkov] Reserve funds have been set up in every sector. But this aid will certainly not always be sufficiently effective, because every serious incident will eat up a very considerable proportion of these funds. Losses will mainly be covered by economically accountable income. The advantage of state insurance over departmental insurance is that the risk is spread over an enormous number of production units, so that a powerful, integrated emergency aid fund can be built up with the minimum payments.

These, in short, are the considerations on the basis of which it is planned to effect compulsory insurance of enterprises' assets to the tune of 50 percent of the full balance-sheet value of fixed and circulating capital. The need for compulsory insurance has been prompted by the experience of other countries, primarily socialist,

which we studied in detail when working on the draft decision. Specialists from many enterprises who took part in the discussion of the draft document are of the same opinion.

If an enterprise so desires, the remaining 50 percent of the value of its assets may also be insured and, if it is expedient to relate compulsory insurance payments to prime production costs, voluntary insurance payments can be taken from economic incentive funds.

[Kogtev] Risk payments will therefore ultimately be related to output costs. Will it not be the case that, as the direct consumers, you and I will not only be paying for events beyond our control but also for those managers who do not wish to take proper care of the property for which they are responsible?

[Nikitenkov] It goes without saying that labor collectives must take care to maintain property. If an enterprise does not make any claims for 3 years we will be able to give it an incentive in the form of a 30-percent reduction in payments.

Strict sanctions are envisaged for negligent managers. If the commission responsible for determining the extent of the damage reaches the conclusion that the damage was caused as a result of breaches of the regulations governing the use of property or as a result of structural shortcomings in the installation concerned, state insurance organs will be within their rights to consider refusing to pay compensation. The offending enterprise will thereby suffer doubly.

[Kogtev] Obviously, the degree of risk and the extent of the damage vary greatly depending on the specific features of the sector and the geographical position of the enterprise. How do these conditions affect payments?

[Nikitenkov] The size of the rates will be established on a differential basis, depending on the degree of risk. At machine building, construction, and light industry enterprises they are close to the minimum, whereas in a sector like the nuclear power industry they will be several times higher. We have based our calculations on statistics built up in ministries and departments, although we do appreciate that in some cases the real extent of the damage could be considerably greater than actually reflected in the reports. In addition to this, we have relied on Soviet practice. We had an insurance system for enterprises in the thirties, but the rigid centralization of economic management forced us to abandon this method of compensating damage.

Documents on this form of state insurance—which is fundamentally new to us—are currently being elaborated and will be further clarified so that in their final form they will be of the greatest possible economic benefit to the state and to enterprises.

Scientific

Sakharov Calls for Underground Nuclear Reactors *LD101408 Moscow TASS in English 1255 GMT 10 Feb 88*

[Text] Moscow February 10 TASS—Academician Sakharov suggests installing nuclear reactors underground deep enough to prevent radioactive leaks even in "worst-case scenario" accidents.

Arguing for this idea as a cardinal way of ensuring safety in the nuclear power industry in the weekly MOSCOW NEWS today, he said that the tragic experience of the past showed that accidents, especially the larger ones, were unpredictable and that technical measures applied to on-the-surface reactors offered only partial security.

Sakharov stressed the need also for "safeguards against possible acts of sabotage and terrorism and for the event of a non-nuclear war" as "the destruction of reactors already on stream in Europe would be tantamount to having hundreds of disasters of Chernobyl's dimension".

He added: "It is imperative to prohibit (stop) the construction of nuclear reactors on the ground immediately and completely.

"It is imperative as a matter of urgency to begin to design nuclear power stations and heat-supply nuclear plants with underground reactors, using the existing designs and uncompleted construction projects to the extent which is possible."

Academician Sakharov continued that "wide-scale underground building calls for new designing, including a sound solution to the issue of insulation to protect subterranean waters in the case of an accident (it is quite possible to build an underlying tray as well as simply to make the right choice of the reactor site)".

Safety in the nuclear power industry, he said, was not a purely economic or technical problem, but also a key moral-psychological issue of the times.

"The future of mankind is unthinkable without the nuclear power industry, but even today we must be developing it in an absolutely safe way," Academician Sakharov emphasized.

Atomic Power Minister Cited on Safety Measures *LD092016 Moscow TASS in English 1904 GMT 9 Feb 88*

[Text] Moscow February 9 TASS—A special centre has been set up in the Soviet Union to collect and analyze information coming from atomic power plants and detect weak spots in their operation, the Soviet minister of atomic power engineering has told TASS.

Nikolay Lukonin emphasized that great importance as being attached to training atomic power plant personnel. "Three centres operating in the country train personnel for work at VVER-1000 (water-cooled) and RBMK-1000 (Lattice) reactors."

"Mindful of the Chernobyl nuclear plant accident," Lukonin said, "we regard it as our principal task to safeguard reliable operation of the fuel core and perfect the protection-control system.

Earlier on, it required 18 seconds to dip rods in the fuel core to put out the neutron current, now only 12 seconds are required.

A system ensuring the complete submersion of rods within two seconds is being tested at the Ignalina atomic power plant in Lithuania.

Within the next two years this system that guarantees against more improbable situations will be installed at all RBMK-1500 reactors," the minister said.

"Besides, the location of atomic power plants will take into account their distance from major cities, seismicity of the area, character of the ground and directions of the wind.

Of course, these are not the only measures that help us in our efforts to enhancing [as received] the safety and reliability of atomic power plants."

On the issue of eliminating consequences of the Chernobyl accident, Lukonin said that last year the average radiation effect on the Chernobyl power plant personnel was 1.5 rems (the international standard is 5 rems a year), this year the indicator would be reduced to 1.2 rems.

Activities of 'Mir' Crew Described *LD091751 Moscow TASS in English 1158 GMT 9 Feb 88*

[Text] Moscow February 9 TASS—In the course of a year, the orbital research complex Mir has been continuously in manned flight. At present working on board the complex are the cosmonauts Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov.

In accordance with the plan of routine preventive measures, they replaced yesterday one of the blocs in the television communication system, checked on the functioning of instruments and equipment.

Today the crew devoted a considerable part of their working time to experiments aimed at further perfecting methods of galvanic anti-corrosion coating in conditions of weightlessness.

According to the results of medical check, Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov are in good health. The pulse rate of the crew commander is 70, of the flight engineer—68 per minute, arterial pressure is respectively 120 by 80 and 115 by 75 mm. of mercury table. Both cosmonauts feel well.

Romanenko on Post-Space Flight Reactions

LD091747 Moscow TASS in English 1053 GMT
9 Feb 88

[Text] Kislovodsk, Northern Caucasus February 9
TASS—By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova:

A little over a month after completing his record-long 326-day mission in orbit, Cosmonaut Yuri Romanenko is again dreaming of further space flights.

"By contrast, when up there in orbit, I wasn't feeling nostalgic for earth," he told this correspondent.

The new development is yet to be studied by scientists involved with preparing spacemen for their missions.

Psychologists used to believe only recently that human beings on long flights could be depressed by their detachment from the customary conditions of life on earth.

"But those apprehensions have not materialized," said Romanenko, pointing to the action-packed working days as a factor.

"The communications line with earth was busy all the time. We would contact ground control every hour and hold constant radio exchanges with specialists checking the state of on-board systems.

"At times, it was even vexing that we had to interrupt some exciting work so often," the spaceman, who is taking a rest here after the mission, recalled.

Asked if he had been missing his near ones and friends during the nearly one-year-long stay aloft, he said: "Sure, I often wished I could be with them. And the weekly communications sessions with them gave me that feeling of being together. It is very appropriate that these sessions are called psychological support services."

Speaking of the psychological climate aboard, Romanenko said he had remained even-tempered and calm throughout the flight, explaining this, among other things, by the apt choice of his teammates.

"Once we talk about nostalgia, we should talk about nostalgia for space, which one feels after completing a mission. The feeling is familiar to everybody who has experienced the incomparable sense of weightlessness and seen the inimitable colors of space," Romanenko concluded.

Military

Stalin's Role in Air Defense Forces Recalled

PM091307 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
3 Feb 88 Second Edition p 2

[KRSNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Major A. Dokuchayev review of readers' letters: "View Through the Years. Protecting Heaven and Earth"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Excerpts] The editorial office continues to receive letters in connection with the decision to publish the scientific work "The Soviet People's Great Patriotic War" ["Velikaya Otechestvennaya Voyna Sovetskogo Naroda"] and KRSNAYA ZVEZDA published 21 January this year material under the headline "The Navy in Action" which raised problems concerning the Navy's combat activity. Today the conversation turns to the combat past of the Air Defense Forces. [passage omitted]

Correspondent. Was it possible to foresee the existing flaws before the war? For by and large the improvement of the troops was proceeding successfully.

Lieutenant General, retired, V. Godun. Our conversation cannot avoid the following element. I.V. Stalin's cult of personality left its mark on this process. I mean the repressions in the prewar years and the deaths of many military leaders. I.P. Ubovich, A.I. Yegorov, and M.N. Tukhachevskiy died tragically.... I will stress that the death of each one of them is more than just the death of a gifted military commander. Let us recall 1925. M.B. Frunze, the darling of the people and of the Army, died. A great loss. But the cause and his ideas survived and were developed very powerfully. In the prewar years everything was different. Tukhachevskiy had been repressed and all his ideas were seen as harmful. Here are a few details. Before the war, thanks to Mikhail Nikolaevich's efforts, a special air defense zone was set up near Moscow where the latest technical means underwent tests and where the basics for the use of troops in combat were formulated. After his arrest the zone was closed down. [passage omitted]

Marshal of Aviation Ye. Savitskiy. It has been said here that I.V. Stalin's cult of personality was detrimental to the business of improving the Air Defense Forces. Indisputably, this is the case; but to be fair I must point out that during the war and during the postwar period Stalin devoted great attention to the Air Defense Forces. With his participation a special resolution was adopted 9 July 1941 by the State Defense Committee "On Moscow's Air Defense." This enabled the First Air Defense Corps to have enough equipment by the start of the enemy's air offensive on the capital (21 July). He often visited command posts and took part in exercises with the Moscow Air Defense zone leadership. Stalin was responsible for the idea of directly subordinating fighter aircraft to the commander of the country's Air Defense Forces

and to corps and divisional air defense region commanders at local level, which improved administration. In the postwar period the Air Defense Forces were formed as an independent arm of the services. He also played an active role here. [passage omitted]

Prosecutor Outlines Limits of Self-Defense

PM041709 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
26 Jan 88 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with Lieutenant General of Justice B. Popov, chief military prosecutor, by correspondent Colonel A. Drovosekov: "The Right To Stand Up For Oneself"; date and place not given; first five paragraphs are reader's letter]

[Text] "Esteemed Editors!

"Great work is being done in our unit to explain the need to be active in carrying out official duties and in defending the state's interests and socialist property and not to overlook violations of public order and of the individual's rights and dignity, as the USSR Constitution and the general military regulations demand of every citizen and serviceman.

"In specific circumstances, however, when it is necessary to bar the way of those who violate law and order, including the rules governing regulation relations, far from everyone acts decisively and boldly, fearing that they themselves will end up in conflict with the law.

"I would like to know what actions by servicemen in the struggle against violators of public order are considered fair and legal.

"Senior Lieutenant A. Ivanov."

The conversation between Colonel A. Drovosekov, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent, and the chief military prosecutor began with the question raised in the reader's letter.

[Drovosekov] As I understand it, Boris Sergeyevich, the reader is interested in the legal norms which define not only the duties but also the right of every serviceman to defend himself and to protect others from an infringement of their honor and dignity. What are these norms, and what is their essence?

[Popov] In Soviet criminal legislation there is a law on justifiable defense. It lays down the legal norms according to which citizens' actions in stopping criminal actions are recognized as socially useful, fair, and legal, even if the violator of law and order is harmed.

The law on justifiable defense, envisaged by Article 13 of the Fundamentals of Criminal Legislation of the USSR and the union republics, proclaims:

"An action is not a crime, even though it comes under the elements of an act provided for in criminal law, if it is committed in a condition of justifiable defense, that is, by harming an aggressor when protecting the interests of the Soviet state, public interests, an individual, or the rights of someone defending himself or another person against a socially dangerous transgression, providing the limits of justifiable defense have not been exceeded here."

Thus, the law also makes it incumbent on every serviceman to defend and protect the interests of the state and society. For example, when performing combat duty and combat service, when guarding the state border, and while on guard duty or on internal detail. At the same time, it also grants the right to defend oneself against possible attack both while performing service and in other circumstances.

In its resolution of 16 August 1984 a USSR Supreme Court plenum defined the right to justifiable defense as an important guarantee of the realization of the constitutional provisions on the inviolability of the person and of citizens' residence and property. Courts are instructed to take into account the fact that citizens have the right to active measures in protection against a socially dangerous transgression by harming the aggressor, regardless of the possibility of flight or of any other method of evading attack.

[Drovosekov] Thus, a soldier has the right to rebuff a fellow serviceman who uses his fists, say, to assert the senior soldier's "privileges"?

[Popov] Of course. For we are talking of an encroachment on the individual. What is understood by encroachment is a socially dangerous action which harms or threatens to harm interests protected by law—state, public, personal interests. It is also an attack on the person involving the use of various kinds of violence, which poses a threat to that person's life or health.

Every serviceman is obliged to value his military honor. How is it possible to tolerate the humiliation of one's own human dignity or the dignity of one's comrades? Not dealing a resolute rebuff to whoever commits such actions means discrediting one's honor. But, of course, it is necessary to know definitely when a condition of justifiable defense arises, affording the right to self-defense and the right to stand up for oneself by force.

Such a condition arises when an attacker's actions are socially dangerous, that is, when material harm is caused to the person and the rights of the person defending himself or someone else, or when there is a threat of such harm. Defense is permissible when an attack has already begun and is still in progress, or when one is to be expected, although it has not begun, and it becomes clear to the person defending himself that the danger is obvious and inevitable. Then it is no good waiting. It is

necessary to act. But, I emphasize, defense is permissible when an attack really exists and is being carried out, not when it is a question of a seeming or imagined attack.

Court practice takes account of the fact that in cases of mental agitation resulting from an attack and its suddenness a person defending himself is not always able to weigh the nature of the danger threatening him and to choose means of defense which will not have grave consequences for the attacker. In such cases the person defending himself is not held responsible for harm caused to the attacker.

[Drovosekov] Life shows that conflicts arise out of violations of the regulation rules governing relations among servicemen if there are no relationships of subordination among them. However, a junior commander does raise a hand against a soldier or seaman, albeit very rarely. Does a subordinate have the right to defense in this case?

[Popov] The one-man command principle established in the Army, the chain of command, and unquestioning obedience are a very important condition for correct relations between chiefs and subordinates and for ensuring a high level of military law and order and discipline. If a sergeant raises a hand against a subordinate, that action of his becomes socially dangerous and forms an element of a crime for which the sergeant must be held responsible under the law. A subordinate's defense against such actions by a sergeant is lawful and permissible.

[Drovosekov] But if, say, a company orderly sees someone being mistreated, does he have the right to intercede for him?

[Popov] The internal service regulations oblige the orderly to report all occurrences immediately to the company duty officer, who must take urgent measures to impose order.

At the same time, having reported to the duty officer, he is obliged to take action personally against the violators and help his comrade. By acting in this way the duty officer and the orderly safeguard and protect the established order and thereby stop possible violations of it. Such actions by them are lawful and in full accordance with the law on justifiable defense. If they harm the violators while doing so, they are not held responsible for it. But only, of course, if they acted within the limits of justifiable defense and did not go to extremes.

[Drovosekov] Please explain what is meant by exceeding the limits of justifiable defense.

[Popov] A manifest disparity—that is, clear, understandable, and obvious to everyone and which cannot be doubted or disputed—between the defense and the nature and danger of the attack is held to be excessive, as provided for in the law. The limits of defense are held to

have been exceeded if the person defending himself has used methods and means of defense whose use clearly corresponded neither to the nature of the attack nor to the actual situation. At the same time grievous harm was caused to the attacker which very obviously was not necessary. Clearly, if an injured party responds to a slight shove or slap by seizing a heavy stick and beating the offender about the head, then defense to such a degree does not correspond to the danger of the attack and exceeds the limits of justifiable defense.

[Drovosekov] I could cite many examples of courage on the part of servicemen who have grappled with criminals. However, you frequently encounter the opinion that servicemen interfere in other people's business and risk their life to no purpose. That is what the militia is for....

[Popov] For a serviceman it is a matter of honor and duty always to help everyone, and there can be no two opinions about that. Let us argue further: If a criminal is not detained, he could escape punishment. Impunity makes him more daring and brazen, particularly when he sees that people fear him and try to avoid him. Conversely, intransigence and decisive measures to detain a criminal deter people from committing crimes.

It is appropriate to recall that Article 15 of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree of 26 July 1966 "On Increasing Responsibility for Hooliganism" laid down that citizens' actions aimed at stopping criminal offenses and detaining a criminal are lawful in accordance with USSR and union republic legislation and do not entail criminal or other responsibility, even if the criminal was unavoidably harmed. In this case the criminal is given treatment at his own expense.

It should be borne in mind that if a criminal, even a very dangerous one, ceases his attack, does not resist, and gives himself up, then it is not permitted to cause him any harm. He will answer according to the law. On no account is it permitted to use violence or mob law against him.

[Drovosekov] I know of a case where a serviceman defending himself against four hooligans who suddenly attacked him without cause and who, moreover, were armed with lengths of water pipes killed one of them and was not punished for it. How in this case did the court determine the proportionality between the instruments of attack and the means of defense?

[Popov] Every case is different. Each one must be investigated specifically. Yet it is undesirable to deprive even an audacious offender of his life. Of course, this cannot always be avoided—in justifiable defense the person defending himself chooses the method of defense with due regard to the whole situation of the attack.

Here is an example for you. Private Bagayev was taunting [glumitsya] Dzhivanov, a young soldier. Defending himself, Dzhivanov began brandishing a penknife, but even that did not stop Bagayev. Then Dzhivanov struck him in the chest and abdomen. Bagayev died of his injuries.

Dzhivanov had not wanted that. But what was he to do? Suffer an outrage? The court established that in the situation which had been created Dzhivanov, because of the great mental agitation that seized him as a result of the assault and battery [izbiyeniye], had not been in a position to accurately weigh and assess the danger of the attack and to choose commensurate means of defense. Dzhivanov was deemed innocent. As you see, court practice recognizes that there cannot be any obligatory proportionality or commensuration between the methods and instruments of attack and defense. Such proportionality is not feasible in practice, since it is impossible to foresee everything here.

It can also happen that an instrument of attack passes into the hands of the person defending himself, whereupon he sometimes causes grievous harm to the attacker. Such actions by a person defending himself are deemed legal, fair, and necessary.

[Drovosekov] An active, intransigent stand by every Soviet person is important for stopping offenses. However, far from everyone—servicemen included—adopts such a position. What could account for this?

[Popov] Unfortunately, a passive attitude toward anti-social and illegal actions, when people are afraid to deal a rebuff, protect the interests of the state and society, and stand up for themselves and their comrades, is still not

uncommon. But why are they afraid? Because they fear that others will not help and support them or else will even censure them for harming a violator. It is said that you yourself will not be glad that you got involved with a hooligan.

These views are fundamentally wrong. They sometimes stem from ignorance of what the legislation permits, while moral duty commands you to defend yourself, intercede for a comrade, extricate him from danger, and resolutely rebuff a malicious violator. On the other hand, you do not often encounter among troops instances where commanders encourage soldiers, sergeants, and officers for boldness and courage in stopping misdemeanors and crimes. Is this not why, even during court trials, those who have suffered behave timidly and do not try to brand the guilty persons? Instances of both boldness and passiveness frequently are not made public or discussed openly at personnel meetings—which also does not help to foster activeness in the struggle against violations.

Commanders must give all possible support to those who resolutely oppose violators of military law and order and all criminal actions and step up attention to this aspect of legal education. I think they will be helped here by the theses drawn up by the Chief Military Prosecutor's Office on the legal aspects of servicemen's active life stance in strengthening law and order. They have been sent to all military prosecutor's offices. An important role in this also belongs to the military press, which is called upon to explain the law on justifiable defense and to highlight those who deserve approval and respect for boldness and decisiveness and those who have displayed indifference and cowardice and abandoned their military honor and dignity.